

**The Ramakrishna Mission  
Institute of Culture Library**

**Presented by**

**Dr. Baridbaran Mukerji**

**RMIOL—8**

**7**

**17627**

action should have been tried before the whole assembly. It is much more probable, especially when suits were multiplied, that the same court of judicature had several divisions, in which the trial of several causes could proceed simultaneously<sup>h</sup>.

As a difference was made between private and public actions, we might expect to find different tribunals for the one and the other. Yet this was not the case; suits of both kinds were tried before the same courts. The difference must therefore have been in the methods of trial and the legal remedies<sup>i</sup> to which the two parties could resort. We are astonished to find that the rules respecting what suits should come before each particular court were so uncertain, that it would be vain for us to attempt to settle any general principles on the subject. But at this moment we have in England an example, which shows how vain it is to expect exact regulations, where courts of justice have been formed and enlarged by accidental circumstances. Criminal cases, it is true, belong exclusively to the Court of King's Bench; but it shares civil actions with the Court of Common Pleas and the Exchequer, in so much that, with few exceptions, certain classes of suits cannot be said to belong exclusively to either of these tribunals.

Our remarks on the organization of the courts apply more immediately to Athens; but they will without doubt admit of extension to the other Grecian cities. Yet on one point there was a remarkable difference. Though the popular tribunals were generally in use, they did not prevail in every state. For, if I understand Aristotle rightly, there were no popular tribunals

<sup>h</sup> We would not say that all trials were necessarily brought before those courts. In Athens the police officers had a jurisdiction of their own; and affairs belonging to their department appear to have been summarily decided by them.

<sup>i</sup> As e. g. the *παραγραφή*, the *ὑπωμοσία*, and others, in the public trials. SIGON. *de R. A.* iii. 4.









A SKETCH  
OF  
THE POLITICAL HISTORY  
OF  
ANCIENT GREECE.

BY A. H. L. HEEREN,

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GOETTINGEN, ETC. ETC.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN.

THE SECOND EDITION, CAREFULLY CORRECTED, WITH  
AN INDEX AND OTHER ADDITIONS.

OXFORD : D. A. TALBOYS.

M DCCC XXXIV.

17627

MC  
MC  
v  
MC

## ADVERTISEMENT.

THE present volume forms a part of Professor Heeren's work on the *Politics, Intercourse, and Commerce* of the chief Nations of Antiquity: and is in substance reprinted from a separate translation of it, executed by Mr. Bancroft, and published in 1823, at Philadelphia, in the United States. It has however been carefully revised with a view to the style; and such alterations introduced as seemed necessary for clearness and precision: it has moreover been compared with the fourth edition of the original, which appeared in 1826, and some additions and alterations which had been made by the author have been incorporated in the translation. An index, too, is now, for the first time, added to the work.

The author states in his preface that his intention being to treat of the political institutions and the commerce of the Greeks, he has completed the first of these two subjects in the present volume, and that he proposes to discuss the other in a second volume, which would include an inquiry into the Grecian colonies. It is now eight years since this promise was made, and we fear that at the advanced age of the author, there is now little hope of its fulfilment: if however this part should ever appear, a translation of it will be published to accompany the present volume. In the mean time, it may be remarked that the first part is complete in itself, and is independent of any additional inquiries into the commercial system of the Grecian states.

*October, 1834.*



# CONTENTS.

	Page
GENERAL Introduction .....	1
CHAPTER I.	
Geographical View of Greece .....	13
CHAPTER II.	
Earliest State of the Greek Nation; and its different Races .....	37
CHAPTER III.	
Original Sources of the Civilization of the Greeks.....	43
Religion .....	ib.
Colonies from Abroad .....	64
CHAPTER IV.	
The Heroic Age. The Trojan War .....	71
CHAPTER V.	
The Period following the Heroic Age. Emigrations.	
Origin of Republican Forms of Government, and their Character .....	86
CHAPTER VI.	
Homer. The Epic Poets .....	93
CHAPTER VII.	
Means by which the National Character was preserved...	108
CHAPTER VIII.	
The Persian War and its Consequences .....	123

**CHAPTER IX.**

- Constitutions of the Grecian States..... 136

**CHAPTER X.**

- The Political Economy of the Greeks..... 159

**CHAPTER XI.**

- The Judicial Institutions ..... 187

**CHAPTER XII.**

- The Army and Navy ..... 197

**CHAPTER XIII.**

- Statesmen and Orators..... 220

**CHAPTER XIV.**

- Influence of Philosophy on the Government ..... 242

**CHAPTER XV.**

- Influence of Poetry on the Government ..... 273

**CHAPTER XVI.**

- Causes of the Fall of Greece ..... 294

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

---

To the student of the history of man, there is hardly a phenomenon more important in itself, or more difficult of explanation, than the superiority of Europe over the other parts of our earth. With whatever justice other lands and nations may be estimated, it cannot be denied that the noblest and best of every thing, which man has produced, sprung up, or at least ripened, on European soil. In the multitude, variety, and beauty of their natural productions, Asia and Africa far surpass Europe ; but in every thing which is the work of man, the nations of Europe stand far above those of the other continents. It was among them, that, by making marriage the union of but two individuals, domestic society obtained that form, without which so many parts of our nature could never have been ennobled ; and if slavery was once established among them, they alone abolished it, because they recognised its injustice. It was chiefly and almost exclusively among them that such constitutions were framed, as are suited to nations who have become conscious of their rights. While Asia, during all the changes in its extensive empires, shows only the continued reproduction of despotism, it was in Europe that the germ of political freedom unfolded itself, and under the most various forms, in so many parts of the same soil, bore the noblest fruits ; which again were transplanted from thence

to other parts of the world.. The simplest inventions of the mechanical arts may perhaps belong in part to the east; but how have they all been perfected by Europeans! What advance from the hand-loom of the Hindoo to the power-loom worked by steam; from the sundial to the chronometer; from the bark of the North American savage to the British man-of-war. And if we direct our attention to those nobler arts, which, as it were, raise human nature above itself,—what a distance between the Jupiter of Phidias and an Indian idol; between the Transfiguration of Raphael and the works of a Chinese painter. The east had its annalists, but never produced a Tacitus, or a Gibbon; it had its poets, but never advanced to criticism; it had its sages, who not unfrequently produced a powerful effect on their nations by means of their doctrines; but still a Plato or a Kant could never flourish on the banks of the Ganges and the Hoangho.

Nor can we less admire that *political* superiority, which the nations of this small region, just emerging from savage life, immediately established over the extensive countries of the large continents. The east has seen powerful conquerors; but it was only in Europe that generals appeared, who invented a science of war really worthy of the name. Hardly had a kingdom in Macedonia of limited extent outgrown its childhood, before Macedonians ruled on the Indus and the Nile. The imperial city of Rome became the heir of the Macedonian conqueror; Asia and Africa prostrated themselves before the Cæsars. Even in the middle ages, when the intellectual superiority of the Europeans seemed to have sunk, the nations of the east attempted to subjugate them in vain. The Mongolians advanced into Silesia; yet nothing but the wastes of Russia remained permanently in their power; the Arabs attempted to overrun the west; but the sword of Charles Martel compelled them to rest contented with a part of Spain; and the chivalrous Frank, under

the banner of the cross, soon bade them defiance in their own home. And how did the fame of the Europeans extend its beams over the earth, when, through Columbus and Vasco de Gama, the morning of a fairer day began to dawn upon them. The new world at once became their prey; more than a third part of Asia submitted to the Russian sceptre; merchants on the Thames and the Zuyder See seized on the government of India; and although the Turks have hitherto been successful in preserving the country which they have wrested from Europe, will it remain to them for ever? will it remain to them long? Those conquests may have been made with severity and acts of cruelty; but if the Europeans were the tyrants, they were also the instructors of the world. The civilization of mankind seems to be more and more closely connected with the extension of their influence; and if, in these times of general change, any consoling prospect for the future is opened, is it not to be found in the triumph of European culture in the distant regions of the earth?

From whence proceeds this superiority, this universal supremacy of so small a region as Europe? Here an important truth presents itself at once. It was not undisciplined strength, nor the mere physical force of the community,—but intelligence which produced it; and if the skill of the Europeans in the art of war laid the foundations of their supremacy, it was their superior political science which maintained it for them. But the problem before us still remains unsolved; for we have yet to ascertain what were the causes of this intellectual superiority of the Europeans; and why their faculties were developed to so much greater an extent, and in so much greater perfection, than among other nations.

To such a question no perfectly satisfactory answer can be given. The fact to be accounted for is of far too extensive and complicated a nature. It will be

readily conceded, that it could only be the consequence of many conspiring causes; some of which can be separately enumerated; and therefore may afford a partial explanation of it. But to enumerate them all, to show this influence singly and when united,—this could only be done by a master spirit, to whom it should be granted, from a higher point of view than any to which a mortal can attain, to contemplate the whole web of the history of our race, the course and the tangles of the various threads.

One important circumstance, however, here excites the attention; and yet a circumstance, of which the cautious inquirer hardly ventures to fix the value. Whilst we see the surface of the other continents covered with nations of different, and always of dark, colour, (and, in so far as this determines the race, of different races,) the inhabitants of Europe belong only to one race. This continent has not now, and never had, any other native inhabitants than the white nations<sup>a</sup>. Is the white man distinguished by higher natural endowments? Has he by means of them an advantage over his coloured brethren? This is a question which physiology cannot answer, and to which history must reply with timidity. Who can deny that the difference of organisation which we observe to accompany in such unequal degrees the difference in colour, may have an influence on the more rapid or tardy developement of the mind? But who can, on the other hand, demonstrate this influence, without first lifting that mysterious veil, which conceals from us the connection between body and mind? And yet we must esteem it probable; and how greatly does this probability increase in strength, if we look into history? The great superiority which the white nations in all ages and countries have possessed, is a fact which cannot be denied. It may be said, this was the con-

<sup>a</sup> The gipsies are foreigners; and it may seem doubtful whether the Laplanders are to be reckoned in the white or yellow race.

sequence of external circumstances which favoured them more than the other races. But has this always been so? And why has it been so? And further, why did those darker nations, which rose above the savage state, attain only to a degree of civilisation of their own; a degree which was passed neither by the Egyptian nor by the Mongolian, neither by the Chinese nor the Hindoo? And among them, why did the black remain behind the brown and the yellow? If these observations cannot but make us inclined to attribute a greater or less capacity to the several branches of our race, they do not on that account prove an absolute want of capacity in our darker fellow-men, nor must they be urged as the sole cause of it. Thus much only is affirmed, that experience seems to prove that a greater facility for developing the powers of mind belongs to the light-coloured races; but welcome will be the age which shall contradict experience in this point, and which shall exhibit to us civilised communities of negroes.

But whatever estimate may be formed of this natural superiority of the Europeans, no one can fail to observe, that the physical circumstances of this continent offer peculiar advantages, which may serve not a little to explain the above-mentioned phenomenon.

Europe belongs almost entirely to the northern temperate zone. Its most important countries lie between the fortieth and sixtieth degrees of north latitude. Farther to the north nature gradually dies. Thus although our continent has in no part the luxuriant fertility of tropical regions, yet it has nowhere so ungrateful a climate, as to consume the entire labour of the inhabitants in procuring the means of subsistence. Europe, except where obstacles are produced by local causes, is throughout susceptible of agriculture. It invites, and, indeed, in some measure compels, men to till the soil, for it is suited neither to hunting nor pas-

turage. Although its inhabitants have at various times changed their places of abode, they were never wandering tribes. They emigrated to conquer; to make new settlements, where plunder or superior fertility attracted them. No European nation ever lived in tents; the well-wooded plains offered in abundance the materials for constructing those huts which the inclement skies required. The soil and climate were peculiarly fitted to accustom men to that regular industry, which is the source of all wealth. Europe, indeed, could boast of few valuable products; perhaps of no one which was exclusively its own; but if it was necessary to transplant its choicest productions from distant regions, this want produced the necessity of cherishing or nursing them. Thus art became united to nature, and this union is the mother of the gradual improvement of our race. Without exertion the sphere of human ideas can never be enlarged; but at the same time, the mere preservation of man must not require the exercise of all his faculties. A degree of fertility in the soil, sufficient to reward the pains of cultivation, prevails almost equally over Europe; there are no vast tracts of perfect barrenness; no deserts like those of Arabia and Africa; and the extensive plains begin only in the eastern districts, and these are plentifully supplied with water.

Mountains of a moderate elevation usually interrupt the plains; in every direction there is an agreeable succession of hill and valley; and if nature does not exhibit the magnificence of the torrid zone, her revival in the spring of the year compensates for it by charms which do not belong to the splendid uniformity of tropical climates.

It is true that a similar climate is shared by a large portion of Central Asia; and it may be asked why that district should not exhibit a similar state of society; whereas we find that the pastoral nations of Tartary and Mongolia made no advancement, so long as they

*remained in their own countries without stationary settlements?* But by the character of its soil, by the succession of mountains and valleys, the number of its navigable rivers, and above all, by its coasts on the Mediterranean, Europe is distinguished from those regions in so remarkable a manner, that this similar temperature of the air (which is moreover not perfectly equal under equal degrees of latitude, since Asia is colder) can afford no foundation for a comparison.

But, it may be asked, ought we not to attribute to this physical difference those moral advantages which flowed from the better regulation of domestic society in 'Europe? With this begins in some measure the history of the first civilisation of our continent; tradition has not forgotten to inform us, that Cecrops, when he founded his colony among the savage inhabitants of Attica, instituted at the same time regular marriages; and who has not learned of Tacitus the holy custom of our German ancestors? Is it merely the character of the climate which causes both the sexes to ripen more gradually<sup>b</sup> and more simultaneously, and a cooler blood to flow in the veins of man? or is a more delicate sentiment impressed upon the European, a greater moral elevation, which determines the relation of the two sexes? Be this as it may, who does not perceive the decisive importance of this fact? Does not the wall of division which separates the inhabitants of the east from those of the west, repose chiefly on this basis? And can it be doubted, that this superior domestic institution was essential to the progress of our political institutions? for we assert confidently, that no nation where polygamy was established has ever obtained a free and well-regulated constitution.

Whether these causes alone, or whether others beside them (for who will deny that there may have been

<sup>b</sup> [It has been recently shown, on unquestionable evidence, that there is no foundation for the popular opinion that the age of puberty is earlier in warm than in temperate or cold climates. E.]

others?) procured for the Europeans their superiority; thus much is certain, that all Europe may now boast of this superiority. The nations of southern may, indeed, have preceded those of northern Europe; but although the northern tribes were still wandering in their forests, when the nations of the south had reached a high pitch of cultivation, they made up in the end for their backwardness. *Their* time also came; the time when they could look down on their southern brethren with a just consciousness of superiority. This leads us to the important differences which are peculiar to the north and the south of this continent.

A chain of mountains, which, though many arms extend to the north and south, has its main direction from west to east, the chain of the Alps, connected in the west with the Pyrenees by the mountains of Sevennes, extending to the Carpathian and the Balkan towards the east as far as the shores of the Black sea, divides this continent into two very unequal parts, the southern and the northern. It separates the three peninsulas which run to the south, those of Spain, Italy, and Greece, together with the southern coast of France and Germany, from the great continent of Europe, which extends to the north beyond the polar circle. This last, which is by far the larger half, contains almost all the great rivers of this continent; of the streams which fall into the Mediterranean, the Ebro, the Rhone, and the Po, are alone important for navigation. No other mountain-chain of our earth has had such an influence on the destiny of mankind as the Alps. During a long succession of ages, they parted, as it were, two worlds from each other; the fairest buds of civilisation had already opened under the Grecian and Hesperian skies, whilst scattered tribes of barbarians were yet wandering in the forests of the north. How different would have been the whole history of Europe, had the wall of the Alps,

instead of being near the Mediterranean, been removed to the shores of the North sea! This boundary, it is true, seems of less moment in our time; when the enterprising spirit of the European has carried a road across the Alps, as it has found a path over the ocean; but it was of decisive importance for the times of which we are speaking—for antiquity. The north and south were then physically, morally, and politically divided; that chain long remained the protecting bulwark of the one against the other; and although Cæsar, by at length bursting through these boundaries, in some measure removed the political landmarks, nevertheless, the distinction still continues apparent between the Roman part of Europe, and that which never yielded to the Romans.

Our present inquiries will therefore be limited to the southern part of this continent. Its limited extent, which seemed to afford no room for powerful nations, was amply compensated by its climate and situation. What traveller from the north ever descended the southern side of the Alps, without being excited by the view of the novel scenery which surrounded him? The deeper blue of the Italian and Grecian sky, the milder air, the more graceful forms of the mountains, the splendour of the rocky shores and the islands, the dark tints of the forests, the gardens glittering with golden fruits—all these exist not merely in the songs of the poets! Although the tropical climes are still distant, a foretaste of them is enjoyed even in these regions. The aloe grows wild in Lower Italy; the sugar-cane thrives in Sicily; from the top of Ætna the eye can discern the rocks of Malta, where the fruit of the palm tree ripens, and in the azure distance, even the coast of neighbouring Africa<sup>c</sup>. Here nature never partakes of the uniformity which so long repressed the spirit of the nations that inhabited the forests and plains of the north. In all these

<sup>c</sup> BARTEL's *Reise durch Sicilien*, vol. ii. p. 338—40.

countries there is a constant alternation of moderately elevated mountains, pleasant valleys, and fertile plains, over which Pomona has scattered her choicest blessings. The limited extent of the countries allows, indeed, no large navigable rivers; but an ample indemnification is furnished by its seacoasts, so extensive, and so rich in bays. The Mediterranean belongs to the south of Europe; and it was by means of that sea that the western nations first assumed the rank which they hold among the nations of the world. Let a large barren plain occupy its place, and we should yet be wandering Tartars and Mongolians, like the nomads of Central Asia.

Of the nations of the south only three will engage our attention: the Greeks, the Macedonians, and the inhabitants of Italy<sup>d</sup>. We have named them in the order in which history presents them to us as celebrated nations, although celebrated in different ways. We shall follow the same order in treating of them.

<sup>d</sup> [This volume contains all that the author has published on the ancient nations of Europe. Hitherto his researches have not been extended to the Macedonians and Romans. E.]

# **G R E E C E.**



# G R E E C E.

## CHAPTER I.

### GEOGRAPHICAL VIEW OF GREECE.

If a person entirely unacquainted with the history of the Greeks were to examine the map with attention, he could hardly remain in doubt that their country, in point of situation, is favoured by nature beyond any other in Europe. It is the most southern of that continent. The promontory of Tænarum, in which it terminates, lies nearly under the same degree of latitude as the celebrated rock of Calpe; and its northern boundary falls somewhat to the south of Madrid. From that promontory to Olympus and the Cambunian mountains, which divide it from Macedonia, it extends about two hundred and twenty-five geographical miles from south to north\*. Its eastern point is the promontory of Sunium, in Attica; from thence its greatest breadth, to the promontory of Leucas in the west, is about one hundred and sixty miles. The greatness of the nation, and the variety of its achievements, easily lead to the error of believing the country an extensive one. But even if we add all the islands, its square contents are a third less than those of Portugal. But what advantages of situation does it not possess over the Iberian peninsula. If this, according to the ideas of the ancients, was the western

\* From 36 $\frac{1}{2}$  to 40 degrees north latitude.

extremity of the world, as the distant Serica was the eastern, Greece was, as it were, in the centre of the most cultivated countries of three continents. A short passage by sea divided it from Italy; and the voyage to Egypt, Asia Minor, and Phœnicia, though somewhat longer, seemed hardly more dangerous.

Nature herself, in this country of such moderate extent, established the geographical divisions, by separating the peninsula of the Peloponnesus from the mainland; and by dividing the latter into nearly equal parts, northern and southern, by the chain of *Œta*, which traverses it obliquely. In every direction hills alternate with valleys and fruitful plains; and if in its narrow compass no large rivers are found, (the Peneus and Achelous are the only considerable ones,) its extensive coasts, abundantly provided with bays, landing-places, and natural harbours, afford more than an equivalent.

The peninsula of Pelops, so called in honour of Pelops, who, according to the tradition, introduced, not war, but the gifts of peace from Asia Minor, is about equal in extent to Sicily, and forms the southernmost region<sup>b</sup>. It consists in its centre of a high ridge of hills, which sends out several branches, and some as far as the sea; but between these branches there are fruitful plains, well watered by an abundance of streams, which pour from the mountains in every direction. This high inland district, which nowhere borders on the sea, is the far-famed Arcadia of poetical tradition. Its highest peak, the mountain Cyllene, rises, according to Strabo, from fifteen to twenty stadia above the sea<sup>c</sup>. Nature has destined this country for herdsmen. “The pastures and meadows in summer are always green and unscorched by the sun; for the

<sup>b</sup> See the map of the Peloponnese by Professor C. O. Müller, in which both the mountains and the boundaries of the several states are laid down with critical accuracy. (Dorians, vol. ii. Eng. Transl.)

<sup>c</sup> STRABO, l. viii. p. 595, edit. Casaub. 1707. The indefinite nature of the account shows how uncertain it is.

shade and moisture preserve them. The country has an appearance similar to that of Switzerland, and the Arcadians in some measure resemble the inhabitants of the Alps. They possessed a love of freedom and a love of money; for wherever there was money, you might see Arcadian hirelings. But it is chiefly the western part of Arcadia (where Pan invented the shepherd's flute) which deserves the name of a pastoral country. Innumerable brooks, one more delightful than the other, sometimes rushing impetuously, and sometimes gently murmuring, pour down the mountains. Vegetation is rich and magnificent; every where freshness and coolness are found. One flock of sheep succeeds another, till the banks of the wild Taygetus are approached; where numerous herds of goats are also seen<sup>d</sup>." The inhabitants of Arcadia, devoted to a pastoral life, for a long time dwelt in the open country rather than in cities; and when some of these, particularly Tegea and Mantinea, became considerable, the contests between them destroyed the peace and liberties of the people. The pastoral state of society among the Greeks, although the accounts of it have been much embellished by the poets, evidently arose among a people who did not wander like nomads, but were fixed in stationary dwellings.

Round Arcadia seven districts were situated, almost all of which were well watered by streams that descended from its highlands. In the south lay the land of heroes, Laconia, rough and mountainous, but thickly inhabited; so that it is said to have contained nearly a hundred towns or villages<sup>e</sup>. It was watered by the Eurotas, the clearest and purest of all the Grecian rivers<sup>f</sup>, which had its rise in Arcadia, and was in-

<sup>d</sup> BARTHOLDY, *Bruchstücke zur näheren Kenntniss Griechenlands*, p. 239.

<sup>e</sup> MANSO has enumerated sixty-seven: *History of Sparta*, vol. i. part II. p. 15. [See also CLINTON, *Fast. Hellen.* part II. p. 401.] And yet Laconia was not much larger than the ancient territory of the city of Nuremberg.

<sup>f</sup> BARTHOLDY, *Bruchstücke*, etc. p. 228.

creased by several smaller streams. Sparta was built upon its banks, the mistress of the country, without walls or gates, and defended only by its citizens<sup>g</sup>. It was one of the larger cities of Greece; but, notwithstanding the market-place, the theatre, and the various temples which Pausanias enumerates<sup>h</sup>, it was not one of the most splendid. The monuments of fallen heroes<sup>i</sup> constituted the principal ornament of the banks of the Eurotas, which were then, and still are, covered with the laurel<sup>k</sup>. But all these monuments have perished; there is a doubt even as to the spot where ancient Sparta was situated. It was formerly thought to be the modern Misitra; this opinion has been given up; a more recent traveller believes, that about six miles from thence he has discovered, in the ruins of Mogula, the traces of the ancient theatre, and some of the temples<sup>l</sup>. At the distance of four miles lay Amyclæ, celebrated for the oracle of Apollo, but not a trace of the sanctuary is now visible; and a road of twelve miles led from Sparta to Gythium, its harbour in that period of its history, when, mistaking its true policy, it built a fleet. On the west and north, Laconia was bordered by mount Taygetus, which separated it from the fruitful plains of Messenia. This country was soon overpowered by Sparta<sup>m</sup>, which, having thus doubled its territory, easily became the largest of all the Grecian cities. But though it remained for a long time in the quiet possession of Messenia, the day of retribution came, when Epaminondas, its restorer, crushed the power of humbled Sparta.

<sup>g</sup> [Fortifications were afterwards erected when Sparta became subject to despotic rulers: CRAMER's *Ancient Greece*, vol. iii. p. 203. E.]

<sup>h</sup> PAUSAN. iii. p. 240. edit. Kuhn.

<sup>i</sup> See the long list of them in PAUSANIAS, p. 240. 243, etc.

<sup>k</sup> POUQUEVILLE, *Voyage*, i. p. 189.

<sup>l</sup> See CHATEAUBRIAND, *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem*, vol. i. p. 25. GELL, *Itinerary of the Morea*, p. 222. [The situation of Sparta has now been completely ascertained: see MÜLLER's *Dorians*, vol. i. p. 78; vol. ii. p. 455. Eng. transl. LEAKE's *Travels in the Morea*, vol. i. ch. 5. E.]

<sup>m</sup> In the second Messenian war, which ended 668 B. C.

A neck of land, called Argolis, from its capital city Argos, extends in a southerly direction from Arcadia fifty-four miles into the sea, where it terminates in the promontory of Scyllæum. Many and interesting associations of the heroic age are connected with this country. Here was Tiryns, whence Hercules departed at the commencement of his labours; here was Mycenæ, the country of Agamemnon, the most powerful and most unhappy of kings; here was Nemea, celebrated for its games instituted in honour of Neptune. But the glory of its early days does not seem to have animated Argos. No Themistocles, no Agesilaus was ever numbered among its citizens; and, though it possessed a territory of no inconsiderable extent, it never assumed a rank among the first of the Grecian states, but was rather the passive object of foreign policy.

In the west of the Peloponnesus lay Elis, the Holy land of Greece. Its length from south to north, if the small southern district of Triphylia be reckoned, amounted to fifty-four miles; its breadth in the broadest part was not more than half as much. Several rivers, which had their rise in the mountains of Arcadia, watered its fruitful plains. Among them the Alpheus was the largest and the most famous; the Olympic games were celebrated on its banks. Its fountains were not far distant from those of the Eurotas; and as the latter, taking a southerly direction, flowed through the land of war, the former, in a westerly one, passed through the land of peace. For here, in the country sacred to Jove, where the Greek nation assembled in festive pomp, and saluted each other as one people, no bloody feuds were suffered to profane the soil. Armies were indeed permitted to pass through the consecrated land, but they were first deprived of their arms, which they did not again receive till they left it<sup>n</sup>. This is the

<sup>n</sup> STRABO, viii. p. 548. Phidon of Argos was the first who violated this sanctity by an invasion, in order to secure to himself the presidency of the

*glory of the Greeks, that they honoured the nobler feelings of humanity, while other nations were unmindful of them.* They flourished so long as they possessed self-government enough to do this; they fell when sacred things ceased to be sacred.

The country of Elis embraced three divisions. The woody Triphylia was in the south, and contained that Pylus, which, according to the judgment of Strabo, could lay a better claim than either of the other two towns of the same name, to have been the country of Nestor<sup>o</sup>. The northern division was Elis, a plain enclosed by the rough mountains Pholoë and Scollis, both branches of the Arcadian Erymanthus, and watered by the Selleis and the Elean Peneus: on the banks of the latter river the city was built that gave its name to the whole region, over which it also exercised supreme authority; for the district of the Eleans, embracing both Pisatis and Triphylia, extended to the borders of Messenia<sup>p</sup>. The middle territory, Pisatis, so called from the city Pisa, was the most important of all, as it contained Olympia. Two roads from Elis led thither, one near the sea through the plain, another through the mountains; the distance was from thirty to thirty-five miles<sup>q</sup>. The name Olympia designated the country round the city of Pisa<sup>r</sup> (which even in Strabo's time was no longer in existence); and here every five years those games were celebrated, which the Eleans established after the subjugation of the Pisans, and at which they

Olympian games (about 900 B.C.): this however could only have been a transient outrage, for when the city of Elis was built, (about 477 B.C.), it was, in reliance on its sanctity, left without the defence of walls: STRABO, *ibid.* It was not till after the Peloponnesian war, that this, as well as so many other religious notions, appears to have been lost.

<sup>o</sup> STRABO, viii. p. 539. The two other towns were situated, one in northern Elis, the other in Messenia.

<sup>p</sup> STRABO, viii. p. 548, relates the manner in which it came to be extended thus far by the assistance of the Spartans in the Messenian war.

<sup>q</sup> According to STRABO, l. c. 300 stadia.

<sup>r</sup> Barthélémy is not strictly accurate, when he calls (iv. p. 207.) Pisa and Olympia one city. Pisa was six stadia (not quite a mile) from the temple; SCHOL. PIN. Ol. x. 55. I have never met with any mention of a city Olympia.

presided. If this privilege gave to them, as it were, all their importance in the eyes of the Greeks; if their country thus became the common centre; if it was the first in Greece for works of art, and perhaps for wealth; if their safety, their prosperity, their fame, and, in some measure, their existence as an independent state, were connected with the temple of the Olympian Jupiter and its festivals;—need we be astonished if no sacrifice seemed to them too great, by which the glory of Olympia was to be increased? Here on the banks of the Alpheus stood the sacred grove, called Altis, of olive and plane trees, surrounded by an enclosure; a sanctuary of the arts, such as the world has never since beheld. For what are all our cabinets and museums, compared with this one spot? Its centre was occupied by the national temple of the Greeks, the temple of the Olympian Jupiter<sup>s</sup>, in which was the colossal statue of that god, the masterpiece of Phidias. No other work of art in antiquity was so generally acknowledged to have been the first, even whilst all other inventions of Grecian genius were still uninjured; and need we hesitate to regard it as the first of all the works of art, of which we have any knowledge? Besides this temple, the grove contained those of Juno and Lucina, the theatre and the Prytaneum; in front of it, or perhaps within its precincts<sup>t</sup>, was the stadium, together with the race-ground, or Hippodromus. The whole forest was filled with monuments and statues, erected in honour of gods, heroes,

\* The temple of Jupiter Olympius, built by the Eleans in the age of Pericles, had nearly the same dimensions as the Parthenon at Athens; 230 feet in length, 95 in breadth, and 68 in height. The colossal statue of Jupiter, represented as seated, nearly touched the roof of the temple, as Strabo relates; and is said to have been sixty feet high. Compare VÖLKEL *über den grossen Tempel und die Statue des Jupiters in Olympia*, 1794.

<sup>t</sup> According to Strabo, in the Altis; Barthélemy says, in front of it. We are still much in the dark respecting the situation of ancient Olympia. What Chandler says is unimportant. The only modern traveller who has made accurate investigations is M. Fauvel. But I am acquainted with his communication to the National Institute, *Précis de ses voyages dans le continent de la Grèce*, only from the short notice contained in MILLIN, *Magasin Encyclop.* 1802, t. 2. He found, it is there said, not only the remains of the temple of Jupiter, but also of the Hippodromus.

and conquerors. Pausanias mentions more than two hundred and thirty statues; of Jupiter alone he describes twenty-three<sup>u</sup>, and these were, for the most part, works of the first artists; Pliny estimates the whole number of these statues, in his time, at three thousand<sup>x</sup>. To this must be added the treasuries (*θησαυροί*) which the piety or the vanity of so many cities, enumerated by Pausanias<sup>y</sup>, had founded by their votive gifts. It was with a just pride that the Grecian departed from Olympia. He could say to himself with truth, that he had seen the noblest objects on earth, and that these were not the works of foreigners, but the creation and the property of his own nation.

The repose for which Elis was indebted to the protection of the gods, was secured to Achaia, the country which bounded it on the north, by the wisdom of men. Having once been inhabited by Ionians, this maritime country had borne the name of Ionia; which was afterwards applied exclusively to the neighbouring sea on the west side of Greece. But in the confusion produced by the general migration of the Dorians, it exchanged its ancient inhabitants for Achæans<sup>z</sup>. Achaia, watered by a multitude of mountain-streams, which descended from the high ridges of Arcadia, was, as to its extent, fertility, and population, one of the middling countries of Greece. The character of the inhabitants corresponded with that of their territory. They never aspired after aggrandizement, or influence abroad: they were not made illustrious by great generals or great poets: but they possessed good laws. Twelve cities<sup>a</sup>, each with a small territory, independent of each other in the management of their internal affairs,

<sup>u</sup> PAUSANIAS, v. p. 424, etc. has enumerated and described that number. Among them there was a colossus of bronze, twenty-seven feet high.

<sup>x</sup> PLINY, *Hist. Nat.* xxxiv. 17. There were as many at Athens, Delphi, and Rhodes.

<sup>y</sup> PAUS. vi. p. 497, etc.

<sup>z</sup> As early as 1,100 B.C.

<sup>a</sup> Dyme and Patræ were the most important; Helice was swallowed up by the sea.

formed a confederacy, which, under the name of the Achæan league, could trace its origin to remote antiquity. A perfect equality was its fundamental principle; no precedence of rank or power was to be usurped by any single city. What an example for the other parts of Greece, if they had been able or willing to understand it! In this manner the Achæans continued for a long time in the enjoyment of happy tranquillity, having no share in the wars of their neighbours. Their country was in no one's way, and attracted no one; even during the Peloponnesian war they at first remained neutral<sup>b</sup>. The Macedonian supremacy finally dissolved the confederacy, and favoured individual tyrants, of whom it made use as its instruments. But the day of retribution was destined to arrive. The Achæan league was renewed and enlarged, and it became most dangerous to the Macedonian rulers.

The small territory of the city of Sicyon (which afterwards belonged to the Achæan league) divided Achaia from that of Corinth. In point of extent this latter state was one of the smallest in Greece; but the importance of a commercial state does not depend on the extent of its territory. Venice was never more flourishing, or more powerful, than at a time when it did not possess a square mile on the mainland. The wealthy Corinth, more than four miles in extent, lay at the foot of a steep and lofty hill, on which its citadel was built. There was hardly a stronger fortress in all Greece, and perhaps no spot afforded a more splendid prospect than Acrocorinthus<sup>c</sup>. Beneath it might be

<sup>b</sup> THUCYD. ii. 9.

<sup>c</sup> See STRABO, p. 261. Of modern travellers, Spon and Wheler ascended it in 1676. CHATEAUBRIAND, i. 36. says, that the prospect at the foot of the citadel is enchanting. If it is so now, what must it have been formerly? CLARKE, Travels, tom. ii. sect. 5. p. 745. describes the few remaining ruins, and the whole neighbourhood of Corinth, especially the Isthmus. He and his companions were not admitted into the citadel, but they received permission to ascend the rock on which it stands, and which, according to Clarke, might be as strong as Gibraltar. They reached the summit before

seen the busy city and its territory, with its temples, its theatres, and its aqueducts<sup>d</sup>. Its two harbours, Lechæum on the western, Cenchreæ on the eastern bay, filled with ships, and the two bays themselves, with the isthmus between them, were all in sight. The peaks of Helicon, and of Parnassus itself, were seen at a distance; and a strong eye could distinguish on the eastern side the Acropolis of Athens. What images and emotions are excited by this prospect!

Beyond the isthmus of the Peloponnesus, which the Grecians, acquainted for a long time with no other, were accustomed to call simply the Isthmus, lay the tract of Hellas proper. The southern half of this region, stretching as far as the chain of ΟEta, was divided into eight, or, if Locris, of which there were two parts, be twice counted, into nine districts; of these, the extent was small, as their number indicates. Near the isthmus, (on which the temple of Neptune, where all Greece assembled to celebrate the Isthmian games, was built in a grove of fir trees<sup>e</sup>,) the small territory of Megara<sup>f</sup> begun; and through this, along the high rocky shore, where the robber Sciron is said to have exercised his profession, the road led to the favourite land of the gods—to Attica<sup>g</sup>.

A neck of land, or peninsula, opposite to that of Argolis, extends in a south-easterly direction about sixty-three miles into the *Æ*gean sea, and forms this country<sup>h</sup>. Where it is connected with the mainland, its

sunset: there is not (he says) a more splendid view in Europe; it reached to the Acropolis of Athens. *Travels*, vol. ii. p. 749.

<sup>d</sup> Corinth is famous, even with the poets, for being well supplied with water; compare EURIPIDES in STRABO l. c. Pausanias enumerates, (l. ii. p. 117.) its many temples and aqueducts.

<sup>e</sup> The remains of this temple are still extant, as well as of the stadium and the theatre. CLARKE's *Travels*, vol. ii. p. 752. The sacred fig-wood also still subsists, from which, according to Pausanias, the chaplets of the victors were taken.

<sup>f</sup> Like that of Corinth, not more than eight miles in length and breadth.

<sup>g</sup> An accurate description of this remarkable, and still dangerous way, is given by CLARKE, p. 764. A part of the ancient paved road is still preserved.

<sup>h</sup> See the map of Attica, by Prof. C. O. MÜLLER.

greatest breadth may be twenty-five miles; but it tapers more and more to a point, till it ends in the *rocky cape of Sunium*, on the summit of which the temple of Minerva announced to the traveller, as he arrived from sea, the land which was protected by the goddess of courage and wisdom. It was not endowed with luxuriant fertility; it never produced so much corn as would supply its own inhabitants; and for this, neither the honey of Hymettus, nor the marble of the Pentelic mountains, nor even the silver mines of Laureum, could have afforded a compensation. But the culture of the olive, an industrious application to the arts, and the advantageous use made of the situation of the country for the purposes of commerce, gave to the frugal people all that they needed; for the activity of commerce was shackled by no restrictive laws. Almost the whole country is mountainous; the mountains are indeed of a moderate height, and covered with aromatic plants; but they are stony and without forests. Their shapes are, however, exceedingly beautiful; the waters of the Ilissus, the Cephisus, and of other rivers, or, to speak more accurately, of other brooks, which flow from them, are as clear as crystal, and delicious to the taste; and the almost constant purity of the air, which lends very peculiar tints to the buildings, as well as to the mountains<sup>1</sup>, opens a prospect which distance can hardly bound. “For without doubt (says a modern traveller<sup>2</sup>) this is the most salubrious, the purest, and the mildest climate of Greece; as Euripides<sup>1</sup> has said, ‘our air is soft and mild; the frost of winter is never severe, nor the beams of Phœbus oppressive; so that for us there are no attractions in the choicest de-

<sup>1</sup> See the remarks of CHATEAUBRIAND on this subject: *Itinéraire à Jérusalem*, i. p. 191. The striking effect which, especially when lighted by the setting sun, the plain of Athens and its monuments produce, as seen from one of the neighbouring heights, is described by CLARKE (*Travels*, vol. ii. p. 782.) with great enthusiasm.

<sup>2</sup> BARTHOLDY, *Bruchstücke*, etc. p. 241.

<sup>1</sup> EURIPIDES in *Erechtheus*, fr. i. v. 15, etc.

lights which are offered by the fields of Asia, or the wealth of Hellas.””

But where the mountains open, and leave room for plains of a moderate extent, the soil is still covered with forests of olive trees, of which the eye can perceive no termination. “ More beautiful are nowhere to be seen. Those of Palermo, or on the Riviera of Genoa, are hardly to be compared with these, which seem as it were undying, and, century after century, send forth new branches and new shoots with renovated vigour<sup>m</sup>. ” Formerly they overshadowed the sacred road, the country of the Ceramicus, and the garden of the Academy; and if the goddess herself, like her disciples, has deserted the soil, she has at least left behind her, for posterity, the first of the gifts which she made to her beloved nation.

Whoever travelled from Corinth and Megara across the isthmus to Attica, reached the sacred city of Eleusis at the distance of about nine miles from Megara. When the inhabitants of that place submitted to Athens, they reserved for themselves nothing but their temples<sup>n</sup>; and hence the mysterious festivals of Ceres continued to be celebrated in their temple. From this place the sacred road, of almost unvarying breadth, led to the city protected by Pallas.

Athens lay in a plain, which on the south-west extended for about four miles towards the sea and the harbours, but on the other side was enclosed by mountains. The plain itself was interrupted by several rocky hills. The largest and highest of these was surmounted by the citadel, or Acropolis, which took its name from its founder Cecrops; around it the city

<sup>m</sup> BARTHOLDY, *Bruchstücke*, p. 220. The same is confirmed by CLARKE, vol. ii. p. 783. The number of the olive trees was stated to him at 40,000.

<sup>n</sup> PAUSAN. i. p. 92. Not only the ruins of the temple are still extant, but also the colossal statue of Ceres, which Clarke brought to England (*ibid.* p. 786.), regardless of the lamentations of the natives, who regarded her as their patron saint.

was spread, especially in the direction of the sea. The summit of the hill contained a level space, about eight hundred feet long, and half as broad: which seemed prepared by nature to support those masterpieces of architecture, which announced, at a distance, the splendour of Athens. The only road which led to it conducted to the Propylaea<sup>o</sup>, with its two wings, the temple of Victory, and another temple, ornamented with the pictures of Polygnotus. That superb edifice, the most splendid monument which was erected under the administration of Pericles, the work of Mnesicles, was decorated by the admirable sculptures of Phidias<sup>p</sup>. They formed the proud entrance to the level summit of the hill, on which were the temples of the guardian deities of Athens. On the left was the temple of Minerva Polias, with the column which fell from heaven, and the sacred olive tree; and that of Erechtheus<sup>q</sup>. But on the right, the Parthenon, the pride of Athens, rose above every thing else, possessing the colossal statue of Minerva by Phidias, next to the Olympian Jupiter, the finest of his works. At the foot of the hill on the one side was the Odeum, and the theatre of Bacchus, where the tragic contests were celebrated on the festivals of the god; and those immortal masterpieces were represented, which, having remained to us, double our regret for those which are lost: on the other side was the Prytaneum, where the chief magistrates and most meritorious citizens were honoured by a table, provided at the public expense. A small valley, Cœle,

<sup>o</sup> Compare the sketches and drawings in STUART's *Antiquities of Athens*.

<sup>p</sup> A part of these masterpieces has perished. By robbing the Acropolis, lord Elgin has gained a name which no other will wish to share with him. The sea has swallowed up one half of his plunder. The other half is now in the British Museum. Does the part which is saved compensate for that which was lost? The devastations of this modern Erostratus are described not only by CHATEAUBRIAND, *Itinéraire*, vol. i. p. 201. but also by his own countryman CLARKE, *Travels*, vol. ii. p. 483, as an eye-witness, with just disapprobation.

<sup>q</sup> Both, forming a whole, were divided only by a partition wall. On the whole detail of the building see MÜLLEN, *Minervæ Poliadis sacra et ædes*, etc. Gottingæ, 1820. And the plan of the city by the same author.

lay between the Acropolis and the hill on which the Areopagus held its assemblies, and again between this and the hill of the Pnyx; where the collected people was accustomed to decide on the affairs of the republic. Here the spot from which Pericles and Demosthenes harangued, is still distinct (it is imperishable, since it is hewn in the rock): not long ago it was cleared from rubbish, together with the four steps which led to it<sup>r</sup>.

If any desire a more copious enumeration of the temples, the porticoes, and the works of art which decorated the city of Pallas, they may find it in Pausanias. Even in his time the best, if not the larger part, had been removed; much had been injured and destroyed in the wars; and yet, when we read what was still there, we naturally ask of Athens (as of so many other Grecian cities) where space was found for so many works of art? The whole country round Athens, particularly the long road to the Piræus, was ornamented with monuments of all kinds, especially with the tombs of great poets, warriors, and statesmen, who did not often remain after death without expressions of public gratitude, which were on that account the more sparingly bestowed during their lifetime.<sup>s</sup> A double wall, called the northern and southern, enclosed the road, which was nearly five miles in length on both sides, and embraced the two harbours of Piræus and Phalereus. This wall, designed and executed by Themistocles, was one of the most important works of the Athenians. It was forty Grecian ells in height, built entirely of freestone, and so broad, that two baggage-wagons could pass each other. The Piræus, to which it led, formed (as did Phaleræ) a city by itself, with its own public squares, temples, market-places, and the commercial crowd which enlivened it; and it seemed

<sup>r</sup> CHATEAUBRIAND, *Itinéraire*, vol. i. p. 184. and CLARKE'S *Travels*; vol. ii. part 2. p. 540.

perhaps even more animated than Athens<sup>\*</sup>. Its harbour, well provided with docks and magazines, was spacious enough to hold in its three divisions four hundred triremes: whilst the Phalereus and Munychius could each accommodate only about fifty<sup>t</sup>. All three were formed naturally by the bays of the coast; but the Piræus excelled the others not only in extent, but also in security.

The plain of Athens was surrounded on three sides by mountains, which formed its limits within no very great distance of the city. The prospect from the Acropolis and the Parthenon commanded on the east the two peaks of Hymettus; on the north, Pentelicus with its quarries of marble; to the north-west, mount Cithæron was seen at a great distance, rising above the smaller mountains; and Laurium, rich in silver mines, lay to the south-east, almost at the end of the peninsula; but towards the south-west, the eye could freely range over the harbours and the Saronic bay, with the islands of Salamis and Ægina, as far as the lofty citadel of Corinth<sup>u</sup>. Many of the chief places of the districts, (*δῆμοι*,) into which Attica was divided, (and of these there were more than one hundred and seventy,) might also be seen; and the situation was distinct even of the towns which covered the mountains. No one of these was important as a city, and yet there were few which had not something worthy of observation, their statues, altars, and temples; for to whatever part of his country the Athenian strayed, he needed to behold something which might remind him that he was in Attica. There were many of which the name alone awakened proud recollections; and no one was so far from Athens, that

\* The Piræus was sometimes reckoned as a part of Athens; and this explains how it was possible to say, that the city was two hundred stadia in circumference. DIO CHRYSOST. *Or. vi.*

<sup>t</sup> The rich compilations of Meursius on the Piræus, no less than on Athens, the Acropolis, the Ceramicus, etc. (GRONOV. *Thes. Ant. Gr.* vol. ii. iii.) contain almost all the passages of the ancients respecting them.

<sup>u</sup> CHATEAUBRIAND, *Itinéraire*, etc. i. p. 206.

more than a day needed to be spent on the road to it. It required but about five hours to reach the long but narrow plain<sup>x</sup> of Marathon, on the opposite coast of Attica. It was twenty-five miles to Sunium, which lay at the southern extremity of the peninsula, and about twenty miles to the boundary of Bœotia.

This country, so frequently enveloped in clouds, lay to the north-west of Attica, and exhibited, in almost every respect, a different character. Bœotia was shut in by the chain of Helicon, Cithæron, Parnassus, and, towards the sea, Ptoüs; which mountains enclosed a large plain, constituting the chief part of the country. Numerous rivers, of which the Cephisus was the most considerable<sup>y</sup>, descending from the heights, had probably stagnated for a long time, and had formed lakes, of which Copais is the largest. This lake must have subterraneous outlets; for while the canals, through which its waters were anciently distributed, have fallen into decay, it has so far decreased in modern times, that it is now almost dried to a swamp<sup>z</sup>. But these same rivers appear to have formed the soil of Bœotia, which is among the most fruitful in Greece. Bœotia was also perhaps the most thickly peopled part of Greece; for no other could show an equal number of large cities. The names of almost all of them are frequently mentioned in history; for it was the will of destiny, that the fate of Greece should often be decided in Bœotia. Its freedom was won at Platææ, and lost at Chæronea; the Spartans conquered at Tanagra, and at Leuctra their power was crushed for ever. Thebes with its seven gates (more distinguished for its extent than its buildings) esteemed itself the head of the Bœotian

<sup>x</sup> CHANDLER's *Travels*, p. 163. A description, as well as a map and view of this district, are given in CLARKE, *plates*, ii. 2. pl. 4, 5.

<sup>y</sup> Distinct from the Cephisus in Attica.

<sup>z</sup> BARTHOLDY, *Bruchstücke*, etc. p. 230. On the ancient subterraneous outlets of this lake, which are among the most remarkable remains of ancient skill and industry, and on the entire geography and early history of Bœotia, see MÜLLER's *Orchomenos*.

cities, although it was not acknowledged to be such by all the rest. This usurpation on the part of Thebes of a supremacy over Bœotia, was of the greatest importance in several periods of Grecian history.

Bœotia was divided by mount Cithæron from Attica, and by Parnassus from Phocis. This district, of moderate size and irregular shape, extended to the south along the bay of Corinth; and was bounded on the north by the chain of Æta. Here are those passes which led from Bœotia to Attica. Of these, the most important is near the city Elatea, and on that account it was early occupied by Philip on his second invasion of Greece. The desert mountain of Parnassus, once associated with the fame of Phocis, presents to the traveller of our times nothing but recollections. Delphi lay on the south side of it, overshadowed by its double peak; and not far above the city was the temple with the oracle of Apollo. Here the masterpieces of art were displayed in countless abundance under the protection of the god; together with the costly and consecrated offerings of nations, cities<sup>a</sup>, and kings. Here in the Amphictyonic council, still more costly treasures, the first maxims of the law of nations, were matured for the Greeks. Hither, on the festival days, when the great games of the Pythian deity recurred, (games surpassed only by those of Olympia,) pilgrims and spectators poured in throngs; here at the Castalian fountain the songs of the poets resounded in solemn rivalry; and, more exciting than all, the acclamations of the multitude.

But all these things have now passed away. Not even ruins have been spared to us by time. Only one monument of doubtful character seems to designate the spot where Ædipus slew his father Laius; and, whilst every vestige of greatness and glory has

<sup>a</sup> Many of them had, as at Olympia, treasures of their own. PLINY, *H. N.* xxxiv, 17. estimates the number of statues at Delphi, as at Olympia and Athens, to have been, even in his time, 3,000.

vaniſhed, nothing but the memory of a crime is per-  
petuated<sup>b</sup>.

Phocis and mount Parnassus divide the two parts of Locris from each other. The eastern part, inhabited by the two tribes which took their names from the city Opus and mount Cnemis<sup>c</sup>, lies along the Euripus, or the long strait, which divides the island of Eubœa from Bœotia: and would have almost nothing to show, that is worthy of commemoration, were it not that the inseparable names of Thermopylæ and Leonidas produce an emotion in every noble mind<sup>d</sup>. "At Thermopylæ," says Herodotus<sup>e</sup>, "a steep and inaccessible mountain rises on the west side in the direction of ΟEta; but on the east side of the road are the sea and marshes. There are warm fountains in the pass, and an altar of Hercules stands near them. On going from Trachin to Hellas, the road is but half a plethrum (fifty feet) wide, yet the narrowest place is not there, but just in front and at the back of Thermopylæ, where there is but room for one carriage." Thus Thermopylæ was considered as the only road by which an army could pass from Thessaly into Hellas, for nothing more than a footpath ran across the mountains; and Thermopylæ, not only during the wars with Persia, but also in the age of Philip, was considered the gate of Greece.

176 27.

The western part of Locris, on the bay of Corinth, inhabited by the Ozolæ, was more extensive, but possessed fewer remarkable objects. Yet its harbour Naupactus has preserved its importance, while so many of the most celebrated cities have become insignificant. It is now called Lepanto, and is perhaps the only town

<sup>b</sup> BARTHOLDY, *Bruchstücke*, p. 251. See the view in CLARKE, *Plates*, ii. part 2, pl. 10, 11.

<sup>c</sup> Locri Opuntii, and Epicnemidii.

<sup>d</sup> The tomb of the Spartans who fell at Thermopylæ is still shown, CLARKE, *Travels*, pl. 13.

<sup>e</sup> HEROD. vii. 176.

of which the modern name is more harmonious than the ancient.

The western parts of Greece, rough Ætolia, and woody Acarnania, are indeed among the largest districts, but are so inferior to the rest in fame, that the historian can do little more than name them. Nature was here neither less sublime nor less munificent ; both were traversed by the largest of the Grecian rivers, the Achelous, which flowed between them ; both were inhabited by descendants of the Hellenes ; both were once celebrated for heroes ; and yet the Ætolians and the Acarnanians remained barbarians after the Athenians had become the instructors of the world.—So difficult is it to comprehend the history of the civilisation of nations.

The chain of Æta, which farther west receives the name of Othrys, and at last of Pindus, and, taking a northerly direction, is connected with the mountains of Macedonia, divides the central from the northern part of Greece. Thessaly, the largest of all the Grecian provinces, (though its extent cannot be stated with accuracy, its boundary on the north having never been defined,) forms the eastern, and Epirus the western part of this country. There is hardly any district in Greece, for which nature seems to have done so much as for Thessaly. The mountains which have been mentioned, surround it on three sides ; while the peaks of Ossa and of Olympus rise above them on the east, along the coast of the Ægean sea. Thessaly can with justice be called the land of the Peneus ; which, descending from Pindus, flowed through it from west to east. A multitude of tributary streams poured from the north and the south into this river. The traditions of the ancients related<sup>f</sup>, that it had stagnated for centuries, when an earthquake divided Olympus

<sup>f</sup> HEROD. viii. 6; STRAB. ix. p. 657.

and Ossa<sup>g</sup>, and opened for it a passage to the Ægean sea through the delicious vale of Tempe<sup>h</sup>. Thus the plain of Thessaly emerged from the waters, with a soil fertilized by constant irrigation. No other district had so extensive a communication by water in its interior; and a little assistance from art, would have made it universal. Its fruitful soil was fitted alike for pasturage and tillage; its coasts, especially the bay of Pagasa<sup>i</sup>, afforded the best harbours for shipping; nature seemed hardly to have left a wish ungratified. It was in Thessaly that the tribe of the Hellenes, according to tradition, first applied themselves to agriculture; and from thence its several branches spread over the more southern lands. The name of almost every district, as Pelasgiotis and Thessaliotis, recalls some association connected with the primitive history and heroic age of the nation. The Doric tribe found in Hestiaeotis its earliest dwelling-place; and who has ever heard the name of Phthiotis, without remembering the hero of the Iliad, the great son of Peleus? Thessaly was always well inhabited, and contained numerous cities. In the interior the most celebrated were Larissa, situated in the midst of the noble plain, and Pheræ; Iolcos, whence the Argonauts took their departure, and Magnesia, were on the sea-coast. But it was, perhaps, the very fertility of the soil which ruined the Thessalians. They rioted in sensual enjoyments; they were celebrated for banquets, and not for works of genius; and although Olympus, the mountain of the gods, was on the boundary of their land, nothing god-

<sup>g</sup> To commemorate the event, a festival was instituted in Thessaly, called the Peloria, which festival seems to have been continued in a christian one. BARTHOLDY, p. 137.

<sup>h</sup> "Tempe forms, as it were, a triple valley, which is broad at the entrance and at the end, but very narrow in the middle." These are the words of Bartholdy, who, of all modern travellers, has given us the most accurate account of Tempe from his own observation, *Bruchstücke*, p. 112. We have now also the description and view by CLARKE, plates, vol. ii. part 2. pl. 10, 11.

<sup>i</sup> Pagasa itself, (afterwards called Demetrias,) Iolcos, and Magnesia.

like was ever unfolded within its precincts. Is it strange that, in the midst of such gross sensuality, the love of self overpowered the love of country; that neither heroes nor poets were created among them by the inspiration of patriotism? Anarchy and tyranny commonly followed each other in regular alternation; and thus Thessaly, always ripe for foreign subjugation, voluntarily bent its neck first under the yoke of the Persians, and afterwards under that of Philip.

On the opposite side of the Peneus, the pure race and language of the Hellenes were not to be found. Other nations, probably of Illyrian descent, dwelt there, such as the Perrhaebians, the Athamanes, and others; of whom as Strabo relates, some considered themselves as belonging to the Thessalian, some to the Macedonian nation<sup>k</sup>. The same was the case in Epirus, which lay to the west. The house of the Æacidæ, a Grecian family, the descendants of Achilles, were indeed the rulers of the Molossians; and the oracle of the Jupiter of the Hellenes was heard in the sacred grove of Dodona: but yet the larger portion of the inhabitants seems hardly to have been of Grecian race.

The mainland of Hellas was surrounded on all sides by islands which were gradually occupied by the Greeks, and came to be considered as parts of their country. They rose above the sea in beautiful verdure, and were surmounted by rocky hills. We can hardly doubt that we see in them the remains of an earlier world; when the waters which covered the central parts of Asia, and the deserts of northern Africa, retired, leaving behind them the Euxine and the Mediterranean seas as two vast reservoirs. Each of those islands commonly bore the name of the chief town of which it formed the territory, with the exception of the three large islands of Eubœa, Crete, and Cyprus, each of which contained many cities. Almost every one of them possessed its

<sup>k</sup> STRABO, vii. p. 494. See MULLER's *Dorians*, vol. i. p. 40. 467—508.

own remarkable objects and its own claims to fame. The fertile Corcyra<sup>1</sup> boasted then, as it does now, of its harbour and its ships. Ithaca, small as it is, shares the immortality of Ulysses and Homer. Cythera, in the south, was the residence of the Paphian goddess. Ægina, inconsiderable as it seems, long disputed with Athens the sovereignty of the sea. What Greek could hear Salamis named, without feeling a superiority over the barbarians? Eubœa was celebrated for its fertility; Thasos for its gold mines; Samothrace for its mysteries; and in the labyrinth of the Cyclades and Sporades, what island had not afforded the poets the subject of a hymn<sup>m</sup>? Delos and Naxos had their gods; Paros its marble; Melos its misfortunes<sup>n</sup>. If so many of them are now desolate; if the alluring Cythera has become a naked rock; if Samos is poisoned by its swamps; if nature herself seems to have grown old; shall we therefore conclude that these things were so in ancient times? The Etesian winds blow indeed with more piercing severity now that the tops of the mountains are naked; the brooks stagnate in the desolate plains; but the change of seasons still produces varying scenes; and the traveller, who at one time finds the Archipelago melancholy and waste, a few months later may contemplate a smiling prospect. "In spring these islands are covered with green turf, with anemones and flowers of all colours. But in the month of August, when the northerly winds prevail, every thing is burnt and dried up, and the parched fields produce no herbage again before autumn<sup>o</sup>."

This view of Greece, though it cannot claim to be considered a regular description, leads us to several remarks which may, perhaps, throw some light on the history of the nation.

<sup>1</sup> Now Corfu.

<sup>m</sup> Need we mention the hymns of Callimachus?

<sup>n</sup> See THUCYDIDES, v. 116.

<sup>o</sup> BARTHOLDY, *Bruchstücke*, p. 194. The whole description of the Archipelago by this traveller is worthy of being consulted.

First: Greece was naturally so divided and cut in pieces, in a geographical point of view, that it was not easy for any one district to gain the supremacy over the rest. Thessaly could not well control the lands which lay to the south of Æta; and still less could Hellas sway the Peloponnesus, or the Peloponnesus Hellas. Nature herself had erected ramparts for those who desired and who knew how to be free. It was easy to defend Thermopylæ, or the Isthmus. We do not here take into consideration the superior power of a foreign invader; but even that could have effected little, so long as the nation refused to forge its own chains.

Again: If Greece was excelled by many countries in fertility, it would yet be difficult, and in Europe at least impossible, to find a land of such limited extent, where nature had done so much for the various branches of industry. Greece was not merely an agricultural or a pastoral, or a commercial country; it was all these together: but different parts of it had different degrees of aptitude for these various branches of industry. The fertile Messenia was fit for the growth of corn; Arcadia for the nurture of cattle. Attica was proud of its oil, and the honey of Hymettus; Thessaly of its horses. Of mines there were not many; still the precious metals were found at Laurium and Thasos. The maritime towns were suited for trade and commerce; the coasts, indented with bays, and the islands, invited to navigation. This variety of active pursuits doubtless directed the Greeks to the acquisition of various kinds of knowledge, which was applied to many objects, and perhaps laid the foundation of their ulterior advancement.

Lastly: No other country in Europe was so favourably situated for a commercial intercourse with the most ancient civilized nations of the western world. On the way to Asia Minor and Phœnicia, one island almost touched another. It was easy to cross into Italy; and

*the coasts of Egypt were not far distant. Even in the fabulous ages a path was discovered from the shores of Thessaly to those of Colchis; and how much earlier, and with how much greater facility, would the Grecian mariner have penetrated to those countries where no rocks, like the Symplegades, opposed the passage of the daring Argo?*

## CHAPTER II.

### EARLIEST STATE OF THE GREEK NATION; AND ITS DIFFERENT RACES.

THE nation of the *Hellenes*, as they called themselves after an ancient leader, (for they received the name of *Greeks* from foreigners,) preserved many traditions respecting their earliest state, representing them to have been nearly on a level with the savage tribes which now wander in the forests of North America<sup>a</sup>. From these traditions it would seem that there was a time when they had no agriculture, but lived on the spontaneous produce of the woods; and when even fire could not be appropriated to the service of man till it had been stolen from heaven. Yet, in the meanwhile, they gradually spread themselves over the country which they afterwards occupied; and all foreign races were either driven from the soil, or were mingled with them. Much is told of the emigration of individual tribes, from the southern districts to the northern, and from these back again into the southern; but the peculiar habits of nomads, as seen in the nations of central Asia, were as unknown to the Greeks as they were to the Germanic nations. The limited extent and the hilly character of their country, which afforded no pastureage for large flocks, did not admit of that kind of life.

As far as we can judge from the very uncertain accounts respecting this early period, it seems that, even in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries before the Christian era, the race of the Hellenes was

<sup>a</sup> *Aeschyl.* *Prom.* 442 sqq.

already so far extended over Greece, that it was everywhere predominant; as it evidently was before the Trojan war. The nation of the Pelasgians, who, with the Hellenes, were the first inhabitants of the country, and who, since their language was different, must be considered as having had a different origin<sup>b</sup>, was perhaps, at an early period, the most powerful; but it was constantly reduced within narrower limits, and either emigrated to Italy and other countries; or, where it preserved its residence, as in Arcadia and Attica, was gradually mingled with the Hellenes, whose power was constantly increasing, until every vestige of the former, as a separate race, was entirely lost. Whilst the Hellenes were thus spreading over Greece, the several tribes of their nation became more and more distinctly marked; and this division was so lasting, and so full of consequences, that the internal history of the nation for the most part depends on it. Of the four most important branches, the Ionians, Dorians, Æoliens, and Achæans, the two first (for the Æoliens<sup>c</sup> were chiefly mingled with the Dorians) and the Achæans were so eminent, that they deserve to be regarded as the chief component parts of the nation. It is important, in order to become acquainted with the people, to know in what parts of Greece these several races were settled. But these settlements did not remain unchanged; the event which had the greatest influence

<sup>b</sup> HEROD. i. 57. The affinity of the Pelasgians to the Hellenes is one of the most difficult problems in early Greek history. The opinion of Herodotus in this passage is founded on the comparison of the language spoken by the Pelasgians of his day in the towns of Creston, Placie, and Scylace, (the two latter on the Ilelespont,) which was so different from the Hellenic, that he considered them as a nation of different origin. This opinion appears to be contradictory to his former statement that the Dorians were of Hellenic, the Ionians of Pelasgic origin. But the Ionians here alluded to are the Athenians, who by the immigration of Ionians, and their mixture with the native Pelasgians, had become an Hellenic nation. Compare viii. 44. If therefore, difference of language is a proof of difference of race, the Pelasgians and Hellenes must be considered as of different races. For to suppose that the Pelasgians of these cities had adopted a foreign language would be a most arbitrary assumption.

<sup>c</sup> EURIPIDES, enumerating in the *Ion*, v. 1581, the races of the Greeks and their extension, makes no mention of the Æoliens.

on them for the succeeding time, happened shortly after the termination of the Trojan war. Till then the Achæan race had been so powerful, that Homer, who, as Thucydides has observed<sup>d</sup>, had no general name for the whole nation, commonly distinguishes that tribe from the others; which he sometimes designates collectively by the name of *Panhellenes*<sup>e</sup>. It possessed at that time almost all the Peloponnesus, with the exception of the very district which afterwards was occupied by it and bore its name, but which was then still called Ionia; and as the territories of Agamemnon and Menelaus, the most powerful of the Grecian princes, both lay in that peninsula, the first rank was clearly due to the Achæans. But soon after this war, it was the lot of that tribe to be in part subjugated and reduced to the severest bondage<sup>f</sup>, and in part to be expelled from the lands where it had resided, and confined to a small district, which from that time was called Achaia. This was a consequence of the migration of the Dorians, under the descendants of Hercules; the chief object of which was the conquest of the Peloponnesus; but it also occasioned a change in the places occupied by the other Grecian tribes. From this time almost the whole of the Peloponnesus was occupied by the Dorians, and the kindred tribe of the Ætolians, who possessed Elis; the district of Achaia alone became the property of the Achæans, who, in quest of a place of refuge, drove from it the Ionians. But, besides this, a large part of the rest of Greece was occupied by tribes which, though not expressly called Dorians, betrayed by their dialects their Doric origin; the Bœotians, Locrians, Thessalians, and even the Macedonian Hellenes,

<sup>d</sup> THUCYD. i. 3.

<sup>e</sup> Πανέλληνες καὶ Ἀχαιοι, Iliad. ii. 530. The Hellenes of Homer are particularly the inhabitants of Thessaly; but the expression *Panhellenes* proves that the name had begun to receive a general application, even at that time, or soon after, when the catalogue of the ships (in which this verse occurs) was composed.

<sup>f</sup> The Helots of the Spartans were, for the most part, descendants of the conquered Achæans. THEOPOMPOS ap. Athen. vi. p. 265.

were of this number; and although the inhabitants of the western maritime tracts and islands were at first called Æolians, their dialects were so similar that they soon ceased to be distinguished from the Dorians. This powerful tribe was also extended towards the east and west by means of its colonies. Several of the islands of the Archipelago were occupied by them; and they flourished on the coast of Asia Minor, and still more in Lower Italy and Sicily, and even in Africa at Cyrene. The Ionic race, as far as we know, retained possession of no part of the mainland of Greece, except Attica<sup>g</sup>. But Attica alone, in glory and power, surpassed all the rest of Greece. Most of the large island of Eubœa also belonged to the Ionians; many of the small islands of the Archipelago were entirely occupied by them; and while their colonies in Asia Minor were decidedly superior, their colonies on the coasts of Italy and Sicily were but little inferior to those of other Grecian tribes.

From the earliest times these two races were distinguished from each other by striking characteristics, which were never wholly obliterated by civilization or intercourse. On the Doric tribe the character of severity is imprinted, which is observable in the full tones of its dialect, in its songs, its dances, the simplicity of its style of living, and in its political institutions. It was most strongly attached to ancient usage<sup>h</sup>. From this its regulations for private and public life took their origin, which were fixed by the prescriptive rules of its lawgivers. It respected the superiority of family and age. The governments of the Doric cities were originally more or less in the hands of the rich and noble

<sup>g</sup> The other Ionians, and even the Athenians, laid aside the name; and none formally preserved it except those of Asia Minor, HEROD. i. 143. Hence the extent of this tribe cannot be accurately stated; and indeed no attempt should be made to trace every little Grecian tribe to its origin, and form a tree of descent for them all. This the Greeks themselves would not have been able to do; but the chief tribes remained distinct.

<sup>h</sup> The character, as well as the history, of the Doric race, has now been completely illustrated by MÜLLER, in his *Dorians*: see vol. 2. p. 405—9.

families; and this is one cause of the greater solidity of their political institutions. Good counsel was drawn from the experience of age; wherever an old man appeared, the young rose from their seats. Religion among the Dorians was less a matter of luxury than of necessity. What important transaction did they ever begin without first consulting the oracle? All this is true of the earliest times. When once the reverence for ancient usage was overcome, the Dorians knew no bounds; and Tarentum exceeded all cities in luxury, as Syracuse did in internal dissensions. After this race had once emigrated to the Peloponnesus, not only the greater part of that peninsula, but also of the neighbouring mainland of Greece was occupied by it.

The Ionians were on the contrary more distinguished for their vivacity and proneness to excitement. Ancient usage restrained them much less than it did the Dorians. They were easily induced to change, if by change pleasure could be gained. They were bent on enjoyment, and seem to have been equally susceptible of the refined gratifications of the mind and those of the senses. They lived amidst holidays; and nothing was pleasant to them without song and dance. Their soft dialect brings to mind the languages of the South sea; but in both cases the remark is found to be true, that a soft language is by no means a proof of deficiency in warlike spirit. In the constitutions of their states, hereditary privileges were either rejected at once, or borne with only for a short time. The sovereign power resided in the people: and although it was restrained by many institutions, the people still decided the character of the government. Anything could be expected of these states rather than domestic tranquillity: nothing was so great that they did not believe they could attain it; and for that very reason they were often actually successful.

These differences in the character of the two most important tribes needed to be mentioned at the begin-

ning. There are few subjects in history which have been so little illustrated, especially with reference to their consequences, as the characters of nations and their different families. And yet it is these peculiarities which, in a certain degree, form the clue in the history of nations. From whatever cause they may proceed, whether from original descent, or the earliest institutions, or from both combined, experience teaches that they are almost indelible. The difference between the Doric and Ionic races runs through the whole of Grecian history. It produced the deep-rooted hatred between Sparta and Athens, though that hatred may have been fomented by other causes; and who needs to be told, that the history of all Greece is connected with the history of those two states?

The difference of races and their dispositions was also one of the chief causes of the subsequent political partitions of the soil. There probably was never a land of similar extent, in which so large a number of states subsisted together. They lived, both the large and the small ones (if indeed we may call those large which were only proportionally so,) each after its own customs; and hence Greece was saved from the torpor of large empires, and was able to preserve within itself so much life and activity.

Of the earliest history of the nation we can expect nothing more than fragments; we leave it to the historian to collect them and to judge of their value<sup>1</sup>; but we must direct our attention to those general circumstances which had a decisive influence on the earliest progress of civilization, if we would form correct opinions with respect to it. Before we can describe the heroic age, we must explain the influence of religion, of the early poetry, and of foreign emigrations, and show how they served to produce the state of society which we designate by that name.

<sup>1</sup> With this view I refer particularly to MÜLLER's works on Greek history, his *Orchomenos* and his *Dorians*.

## CHAPTER III.

### \*ORIGINAL SOURCES OF THE CIVILIZATION OF THE GREEKS.

#### RELIGION.

IT is not easy to decide, whether the civilization of a nation proceeds originally from its sacred or its civil institutions. The character of domestic relations, the proper employment of the means devised for the protection of life and agricultural industry, are the first steps in the great ascent of national improvement: but even these can make but little progress without the assistance of religion. Without the fear of the gods marriage loses its sanctity and property its security. The human and divine are so mingled in our natures, that nothing but a continued harmony between them can elevate us above the mere animal creation. But it has been wisely ordained by the Author of our being, that the feelings of religion can be developed, and thus the character of our existence ennobled, even before a high degree of knowledge has been attained. It would be difficult, and perhaps impossible, to find a nation which can show no traces of religion; and there never yet has been, nor can there be, a nation in which the reverence for a superior being was the fruit of refined philosophy.

The foundation of all religion is the belief in some superior beings (however differently these may be conceived by the mind,) which have an influence on our destinies. The natural consequences of this belief are

certain rites of worship, invocations, sacrifices, and offerings. All this is so connected with the feelings of man, that it springs from within him, and exists independently of all research or knowledge. And this is the religion of the people. But so soon as the intelligent spirit of man was somewhat awakened, a higher principle was separated (though in very different ways) from this simple faith : and that remained in the possession of a small society of priests, of the initiated, of the enlightened. While the popular religion reposed only on faith and indistinct conceptions, there were certain dogmas, or doctrines, preserved by the more enlightened or sacerdotal class, which were often represented by images, and exhibited to the senses by outward ceremonies. These two kinds of religion commonly remained distinct from each other ; and the difference was the most clearly marked in those nations which had a caste of priests<sup>k</sup>; but still there were some points in which they agreed with each other. Even a caste of priests, with whatever secrecy they guarded their doctrines, could influence the people only by means of outward ceremonies. But the less the order of priests is separated by a broad line of division from the mass of the people, the more faint becomes the distinction between the religion of the people and the doctrines of the priests. How far the two differed from each other, and remained different, is a subject for learned inquiry ; the confusion of them has been one of the chief sources of error with regard to the religions of the ancients.

Among the Greeks there never was a distinct caste of priests, nor even, as we shall hereafter observe, a separate order of priesthood. Nevertheless they had also a religion of the initiated ; the mysteries of which reach almost as far back as the popular religion. Each of these must be considered by itself before we

<sup>k</sup> See remarks on this subject in the volumes of this work, relating to the Egyptians and Indians.

can draw any general conclusion respecting the influence of religion on the character of the Greeks.

The popular religion of the Greeks rested on a belief in certain superhuman beings, and in the influence exercised by them over the destinies of mortals; on the fear of offending them, resulting from this belief; and on the custom of worshipping them. Yet, according to the account of the earliest and most credible witness, most of these divinities were not of Hellenic origin; and the learned investigations of modern writers, on the origin of them individually, establish the fact beyond a doubt<sup>b</sup>. "The Hellenes," says Herodotus<sup>c</sup>, "received their gods from the Pelasgians; while the Pelasgians, who at first worshipped their gods without giving them particular names, took the names of *their* divinities from the Egyptians." This account of the historian has difficulties which cannot be entirely cleared up. If it be granted that certain divinities and certain religious rites came from Egypt, we may still ask, how could the *names* have been of Egyptian origin, since the names of the Egyptian gods are almost all known to us, and are very different from those of the Greeks? We learn from Herodotus himself, that it was common for the Egyptian priests, even in his age, to institute comparisons between their gods and those of the Greeks, and to transfer the names of the latter to their own divinities. And this enables us at least to explain how the historian, who was accustomed to hear a Zeus, a Dionysus, an Artemis mentioned in Egypt, could have thought the matter very probable. But the question is still by no means answered. For if the Egyptian priests, in the time of Herodotus, applied the Grecian names to their gods, how can we explain the alleged fact, that the Greeks first borrowed those names from them?

<sup>b</sup> See CREUZER'S *Symbolik*, vol. ii. p. 376, and BOETTIGER'S *Kunstmythologie*, in the chapters on Jupiter and Juno.

<sup>c</sup> HEROD. ii. 50, 52.

There are, however, two circumstances which we may infer from the words of Herodotus himself, and which throw some light on the subject. The historian has not concealed the source of his information. These assertions were made to him at Dodona; he heard then a tradition of the priests of that place. But the oracle of Dodona derived its origin from the Egyptians; can we wonder then that its priests should derive the gods of the Greeks from the same source? Again, it is clear from Herodotus, that the Hellenes did not receive them directly from the Egyptians, but through the Pelasgians; that is, they received them at second hand. We shall hereafter remark that they came chiefly by way of Crete and Samothrace. Could such circuitous routes have left them unchanged? And is it not probable that the Pelasgians essentially altered them in their own way, before delivering them to the Hellenes? Questions of this kind cannot now be answered with certainty; but, however many of the Egyptian gods may have been introduced into Greece, it is certain that not all were of that origin. The father of history has not forgotten to remark<sup>d</sup>, that Neptune, Juno, Bacchus, and others were not of Egyptian origin, and this has been fully substantiated by the acute investigations of the modern inquirers whom we have just cited.

But to whatever country the gods of the Greeks may have originally belonged, they certainly did not remain in Greece what they had been before. We need but throw a glance on their religion to convince ourselves, that the gods of the Greeks became entirely their property, if they were not so originally; that is, that their notions of them were entirely different from those of the nations from whom they were supposed to have been borrowed. Wherever Jupiter, Juno, Neptune, and Apollo may have first been worshipped, no country but Greece adored the Olympian

<sup>d</sup> HEROD. ii. 50.

ruler of the world, the queen of heaven, and the power which encompassed the universe, the far-darting god of light. And it was the same with the rest. What the Græcian touched became gold, though it had before been of baser metal.

But, if the popular religion of the Greeks was formed by changing the character of foreign gods, in what did the change consist? What were the characteristics of the Grecian assembly of divinities? This question is important, not for the history of the Grecian religion alone, but for the general history of religion itself. For the problem is nothing less than to fix on the essential difference between the ancient religions of the eastern and western world.

This characteristic difference may yet be easily discovered; and may be reduced, I think, to a single head.

All inquiries relative to the divinities of the eastern nations, even though the explanations of individual ones may be various, lead to the general result, that they were founded on the worship of some object or power of nature. These may have been first corporeal objects, the sun, the moon, the stars, the earth, the river which watered the country; or active powers of nature, a creating, a preserving, a destroying power; or, which was more usual, both these may have been combined; and visible objects become objects of adoration, as being the expressions of a creating or destroying power. When the gods of the Egyptians, the Indians, the Persians, the Phrygians, the Phœnicians, and others are analyzed, even in cases where the interpretation remains imperfect, it cannot be doubted that some idea of this kind lay at the bottom, and was the predominant one. They had but one signification, as far as this idea was connected with it; and the sacred traditions and mythological tales respecting them, seem to us without meaning, because we have so often lost the key to their interpretation.

"The Egyptians," Herodotus informs us<sup>e</sup>, "had a sacred tradition, that Hercules once appeared before Ammon, and desired to see him face to face. Ammon refused, and Hercules persevered in his request; upon this Ammon slew a ram, veiled himself in its skin, put on its head, and in this plight showed himself to Hercules. From that time the Thebans ceased to sacrifice rams; only once a year, on the festival of Ammon, they kill a single one, hang its skin round the picture of the god, and show at the same time the picture of Hercules." Who understands this story and this festival from the mere relation? But when we learn that the ram, opening the Egyptian year, is the symbol of the approaching spring, that Hercules is the sun of that season in its full power, the story, as well as the festival, is explained as descriptive of the spring, and as a figurative representation of the season then beginning. In this, as in similar cases, the object or power of nature was exhibited in a human shape; the tendency to copy our own form being deeply fixed in our nature. But in all such cases, in the east, where the human form was attributed to the gods, it was but a secondary affair, the indispensable means of presenting them to the senses. It was never anything more. And this is the reason why those nations never hesitated to depart from this human form, and to disfigure it, whenever it seemed possible thereby to give a greater degree of distinctness to the symbolical representation; or if any other object could thus be more successfully accomplished. This is the source of all those singular shapes which the gods of the east generally assume. The Indian makes no scruple of giving his gods twenty arms; the Phrygian represents his Diana with as many breasts; the Egyptian gave them the heads of beasts. Different as these disconfigurations are, they all have their origin in this source; the human form was but a subordinate object;

<sup>e</sup> HEROD. ii. 42.

the chief aim was to give such a representation of the symbol as, according to their feelings, expressed its meaning most distinctly.

As the Greeks received most, if not all, of their gods from abroad, they of course received them as symbols of natural objects and powers; and the farther we look back in the Grecian theogony, the more clearly do their gods appear as such beings. He who reads with tolerable attention the early systems as set forth in Hesiod, cannot mistake this for a moment; nor can it be denied, that there are traces of it in the gods of Homer. That his Jupiter designates the pure ether, his Juno the atmosphere, his Apollo the sun, is obvious in many of his narrations. But it is usually obvious, that his prevailing notion is not the ancient symbolical one, but that his Jupiter is already the ruler of gods and men, his Juno the queen of Olympus.

This then is the essential peculiarity of the popular religion of the Greeks; they gradually dismissed the symbolical representations, and not only dismissed them, but adopted something more human and more sublime in their stead. The gods of the Greeks were *moral persons*.

When we call them moral persons, we do not mean to say that a higher degree of moral purity was attributed to them than humanity can attain (indeed, the reverse is well enough known); but rather, that the whole moral nature of man, with its defects and its excellencies, was considered as belonging to them, with the additional notions of superior physical force, a more delicately organized system, and a more exalted, if not always a more beautiful form. Now these ideas became generally prevalent, and were entertained by the whole people; and thus an indestructible wall of division was raised between Grecian and foreign gods. The former were moral beings; this was their leading character, or rather their whole character; they would have been mere names if this had been taken

from them; but the gods of the barbarians remained only personifications of certain objects and powers of nature; and hence neither a moral nature nor character belonged to them, although the human shape and certain actions and powers were attributed to them.

Having thus illustrated the essential difference between the Grecian and foreign gods, and shown in what the transformation of the foreign gods, adopted by the Greeks, consisted, the question arises, how and by what means did that transformation take place?

By means of poetry and the arts. Poetry was the creating power; the arts confirmed the representations which she had called into being, by investing them with visible forms. And here we come to the important step, from which we must proceed in continuing our inquiry.

"Whence each of the gods is descended, whether they have always existed," says the father of history<sup>1</sup>, "and what were their shapes, all this the Greeks have but recently known. Hesiod and Homer, whom I do not esteem more than four hundred years earlier than myself, are the poets who invented for the Grecians their theogony; gave the gods their titles; fixed their rank and occupations; and described their forms. The poets who are said to have lived before these, lived, as I believe, after them."

This remarkable account deserves a careful attention. The historian expressly remarks that this is his own hypothesis, not the belief of others. He may certainly have been mistaken; but he would hardly express himself so explicitly, unless he had believed himself warranted to do so. We must receive his opinion as the result of such an investigation as could in his age be carried on; and can we do more than he?

He names Homer and Hesiod; and naturally understands by them the authors of the poems which al-

<sup>1</sup> HEROD. ii. 63.

ready bore their names; the two great epic poems of Homer, and at least the theogony of Hesiod. The case does not become changed, even if those productions are, agreeably to a modern opinion, the works of several authors. It would only be necessary to say, that it was the ancient epic poets of the schools of Homer and of Hesiod, who invented the gods of the Greeks; and perhaps this manner of expression is the more correct: for it would be difficult to doubt that the successors of those poets contributed their share.

According to Herodotus, these poets were the first to designate the forms of the gods; that is, they attributed to them not merely the human figure, but the human figure in a particular shape. They distinguished moreover their kindred, their descent, their occupations; they also fixed the personal relations of each individual; and therefore gave them the epithets which expressed these attributes. But if we collect these observations into one, they signify nothing less than that the poets were the authors of the popular religion, in so far as it was grounded on definite representations of the several divinities.

This is not intended to imply, that Homer made it his object to be the creator of a national religion. He only made a poetical use of the previous popular belief. But that poetical spirit, which left nothing indistinctly delineated in the heroes whose deeds he celebrated, bringing before our eyes their persons and their characters, effects the same with the gods. He no more invented his divine personages than he did his heroes; but he gave their character to the one and the other. The circle of his gods is limited to a small number. They are inhabitants of Olympus, and if they do not all belong to the same family, they yet belong to the same place; and they usually live together, at least when that is required by the purposes of the poet. Under such circumstances an inferior poet might have felt the necessity of giving them individuality. And

how much more a Homer? But that he executed it in so perfect a manner is to be ascribed to the superiority of his genius.

Thus the popular notions entertained of the gods were first established by Homer, and established never to be changed. His poems continued to live in the mouths of his nation; and how would it have been possible to efface images which were painted with such strokes and colours? Hesiod is, indeed, named with him; but what are his catalogues of names compared with the living forms of Homer?

In this manner, by means of the epic poets, that is, almost exclusively by means of Homer, the gods of the Greeks were raised to the rank of moral beings, possessed of definite characters. As such they gained life in the conceptions of the people; and however much may have been invented respecting them in the poetry of a later age, no one was permitted to represent them under a figure, or with attributes different from those which were consistent with the popular belief. We soon perceive the various consequences which this must have had on the civilization and improvement of the nation.

The more a nation conceives its gods to be like men, the nearer does it approach them, and the more intimately does it live with them. According to the earliest views of the Greeks, the gods often wandered among them, shared in their business, requited them with good or ill, in conformity to their reception, and especially to the number of gifts and sacrifices with which they were honoured. In this manner those views decided the character of religious worship, which received from them, not merely its forms, but also its life and meaning. How could this worship have received any other than a cheerful friendly character? The gods were gratified with the same pleasures as mortals; their delights were the same; the gifts which were offered them were the same which

please men; there was a common, a correspondent enjoyment. With such conceptions, it was natural that their holidays should have been joyous. And as their joy was expressed by dance and song, both of these necessarily became constituent parts of their religious festivals.

It is another question: What influence must such a religion have had on the morals of the nation? The gods were not represented as pure moral beings, but as swayed by human passions and liable to human infirmities. At the same time, the Greeks never entertained the idea that their divinities were to be held up as models of virtue; and hence the injury done to morality by such a religion, however warmly the philosophers afterwards spoke against it, could hardly have been so great as we with our prepossessions should at first imagine. If it was not declared a duty to become like the gods, no excuse for the imitation could be drawn from the faults and crimes attributed to them. Besides, these stories were esteemed, even by the vulgar, only as poetical fictions; and they felt little concern about their truth, or want of credibility. There existed, independent of those tales, the fear of the gods as higher beings, who, on the whole, desired excellence, and abhorred and sometimes punished crime. This punishment was inflicted in this world; for the poets and the people of Greece for a long time believed that there was no punishment beyond the grave, except for those who had been guilty of direct blasphemy against the gods<sup>g</sup>. Their system of morals was on the whole deduced from the fear of the gods; that fear also produced the observance of certain duties, which were of great practical importance; as, for example, the inviolable character of suppliants, who stood under the peculiar protection of the gods; the sanctity of oaths, and the like;

<sup>g</sup> See an Essay by the author on the opinions of the Greeks as to rewards and punishments after death: *Historische Werke*, vol. iii. p. 214.

of which the violation was also considered as a direct crime against the gods. Thus the popular religion of the Greeks was undoubtedly a support of morality, though not to the same degree as in Christian countries. But that its importance was felt as a means of bridling the licentiousness of the people, is sufficiently clear from the care which the state took during its better days to preserve the popular religion, and from the punishments inflicted on those who corrupted it, or denied its gods. If, however, the influence of the popular religion on the moral character of the Greeks should be differently estimated, there is less room for doubt as to its influence on taste; for that was formed entirely by the popular religion, and continued indissolubly united with it.

By the transformation of the Grecian deities into moral agents, a boundless field was opened for poetical invention. By becoming human the gods became peculiarly fitted for poetry. The muse of the moderns has attempted to represent the Supreme Being in action; which she could only do by investing him, as far as possible, with human attributes. The failure of this attempt is well-known: it was vain to endeavour to deceive us with respect to the chasm which lay between our more sublime ideas of the Divinity, and the image under which he was represented. But the case was altogether different in ancient Greece. The poet was not only allowed but compelled to introduce the gods in a manner consistent with popular belief, if he would not fail of producing the desired effect. The great characteristics of human nature were expressed in them; they were exhibited as so many definite archetypes. The poet might relate of them whatever he pleased; but he never was permitted to alter the original characters, whether he celebrated their own actions, or introduced them as participating in the exploits of mortals. Although themselves immortal, they always preserved the human character, and excited a corresponding in-

terest ; with their weaknesses and faults they stood nearer to man than if they had been represented as possessing the perfection of moral excellence.

Thus the popular religion of the Greeks was essentially poetical. There is no need of a long argument to show that it also decided the character of Grecian art, by affording an inexhaustible supply of subjects.

On this point a single remark will suffice. Among the nations of the east the plastic art not only never created forms of ideal beauty, but was rather exercised in producing hideous ones. The monstrous figures of their gods, which we have already mentioned, are proofs of it. The Grecian artist was secure against anything similar to this, when their gods had become not merely physical, but human moral beings. He never could have thought of representing a Jupiter or Juno with ten arms ; he would have destroyed his own work by offending the popular religious notions. Hence he was forced to remain true to the pure human figure, and was thus brought very near the step which was to raise him still higher, and give ideal beauty to his images. That step he would probably have taken without assistance ; but the previous labours of the poets made it more natural and more easy. Phidias found in Homer the idea of his Olympian Jupiter ; and the most sublime image in human shape which time has spared us, the Apollo of the Vatican, may be traced to the same origin.

Beside the popular religion, Greece possessed also a religion of the initiated, preserved in the mysteries. Whatever we may think of these institutions, and whatever idea we may form of them, no one can doubt that they were of a religious nature. They must then have necessarily stood in a certain relation to the religion of the people ; but we shall not be able to explain, with any degree of probability, the nature of that relation, until we trace them to their origin.

We must preface this inquiry with a general remark. All the mysteries of the Greeks, as far as we are acquainted with them, were introduced from abroad; and we can still point out the origin of most of them. Ceres had long wandered over the earth before she was received at Eleusis, and erected there her sanctuary<sup>b</sup>. Her secret rites at the Thesmophoria, according to the account of Herodotus<sup>1</sup>, were first introduced by Danaus, who brought them from Egypt to the Peloponnesus. Whether the rites of Orpheus and Bacchus originally belonged to the Thracians or the Egyptians, they certainly came from abroad. Those of the Curetes and the Dactyli originated in Crete.

It has often been said, that these institutions in Greece suffered, in the progress of time, many and great alterations; that they commonly degenerated, or, to speak more correctly, that the Grecians accommodated them to themselves. It was not possible for them to preserve among the Greeks the same character which they had among other nations. And here we are induced to ask: What were they originally? How were they introduced and preserved in Greece? And in what relation did they stand to the popular religion?

The answer to these questions is contained in the remarks which we have already made on the transformation and appropriation of foreign gods by the Greeks. Most of those gods, if not all of them, were received as symbolical physical beings; the poets made of them moral agents; and as such they appear in the religion of the people.

The symbolical meaning would have been lost if no means had been provided to ensure its preservation. The mysteries, it seems, afforded such means. Their

<sup>b</sup> ISOCRAT. *Paneg.* p. 46; ed. Steph. and many other passages in MEURSI *Eleusin.* cap. i.

<sup>1</sup> HEROD. iv. 172.

great end therefore was, to preserve the knowlege of the peculiar attributes of those divinities which had been incorporated into the popular religion under new forms; what powers and objects of nature they represented; how these, and how the universe came into being; in a word, cosmogonies, like those contained in the Orphic doctrines. But this knowledge, though it was preserved by oral instruction, was perpetuated no less by symbolical representations and usages; which, at least in part, consisted of those sacred traditions and fables of which we have already made mention. "In the temple of Sais," says Herodotus, "representations are given by night of the adventures of the goddess; and these are called, by the Egyptians, mysteries; of which, however, I will relate no more. It was from thence that these mysteries were introduced into Greece<sup>k</sup>." Admitting this even to be the chief design of the mysteries, it does not follow that it was the only one. Indeed, it is very probable that, in the progress of time, a great variety of representations may have arisen in the mysteries; their original meaning might perhaps be gradually and entirely lost, and another be introduced in its stead<sup>l</sup>.

Those passages may, therefore, be very easily explained, which import that the mysteries, as has been

<sup>k</sup> HEROD. l. c.

<sup>l</sup> On the important subject of the mysteries the valuable work of ST. CROIX may be consulted, especially in the German translation, *Versuch über die alten Mysterien*, by LENZ, 1790; to which book I refer for the necessary citations. It does not belong to the political historian to pursue this investigation any farther; he must leave it to the student of the history of religions. Yet two remarks may here be permitted. First: Homer and Hesiod say nothing of mysteries; which may very possibly have been older than those poets, but are thus proved to have had in their time less importance than they afterwards gained. And this is immediately explained, so soon as the proper object of the mysteries is discovered, by distinguishing between the popular religion, as modified by the poets, and the ancient elementary religion of the east. Secondly: The mysteries introduced from Crete are said to have constituted the public worship of the Cretans. It was in Greece then that they first came to be mysteries. This, too, can hardly be more naturally explained than by the departure of the popular religion, as established by the poets, from the other more ancient one. [By far the best work on the Greek mysteries is LOBECK's *Aglaophamus*: see the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, vol. VII. p. 33. E.]

particularly asserted of those of Eleusis, exhibited the superiority of civilized over savage life, and gave instructions respecting a future life and its nature. For what was this more than an interpretation of the sacred traditions which were told of the goddess, as the instructress in agriculture, of the forced descent of her daughter to the lower world, etc.? And we need not be more astonished, if in some of their sacred rites we perceive an excitement carried to the borders of that enthusiastic frenzy, which belonged indeed peculiarly to the east, but which the Greeks were not unwilling to adopt. For we must not omit to bear in mind that they shared the spirit of the east; living as they did on the very boundary line between the east and west. As those institutions were propagated farther to the west they lost their original character. We know what the Bacchanalian rites became at Rome; and had they been introduced north of the Alps, what form would they have there assumed? To those countries it was indeed possible to transplant the vine, but not the service of the god to whom the vine was sacred. The orgies of Bacchus were equally unsuited to the cold soil and inclement forests of the north, and to the character of its inhabitants.

The secret doctrines which were taught in the mysteries, may have finally degenerated into mere forms and an unmeaning ritual. And yet the mysteries exercised a great influence on the spirit of the nation, not of the initiated only, but also of the great mass of the people; and perhaps they influenced the latter still more than the former. They preserved the reverence for sacred things; and this gave them their political importance. They produced that effect better than any modern secret societies have been able to do. The mysteries had their secrets, but not every thing connected with them was secret. They had, like those of Eleusis, their public festivals, processions, and pilgrimages; in which none but the initiated took a part, but

of which no one was prohibited from being a spectator. Whilst the multitude were permitted to gaze at them, they learned to believe, that something sublimer than anything which they knew was revealed to the initiated; and while the value of that sublimer knowledge did not consist in secrecy alone, it did not lose any of its value by being concealed.

Thus the popular religion and the secret doctrines, although always distinguished from each other, united in serving to curb the people. The condition and the influence of religion on a nation are always closely connected with the situation of those persons who are particularly appointed for the service of the gods, the priests. The regulations of the Greeks concerning them deserve the more attention, since many unimportant subjects of Grecian antiquities have been treated with an almost disproportionate expense of industry and erudition: but with respect to the priesthood of the nation, we are as yet left without any investigation corresponding to the importance of the subject<sup>m</sup>. The very abundance of matter renders it the more difficult, for very little can be expressed in general terms; and many changes were brought about by time.

During the heroic age, we learn from Homer, that there were priests, who seem to have devoted themselves exclusively to that vocation. We readily call to mind Calchas, Chryses, and others. But even in that age such priests appear but seldom; and it does not appear that their influence over the rest of the people was considerable. The sacred rites in honour of the gods were not performed by them alone; they were not even required at the public solemnities. The generals and commanders themselves offer their sacri-

<sup>m</sup> The chief outlines of this investigation are sketched by MÜLLER, *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie*, p. 249 sq. His views agree with those expressed in the text.

fices<sup>n</sup>, perform the prayers, and observe the signs which indicated the result of an enterprise. In a word, kings and generals were at the same time priests.

Traces of these very ancient regulations were preserved for a long time among the Greeks. The second archon at Athens, who presided at the public ceremonies of worship, was called the king, because he had to prepare the sacred rites, which were formerly regulated by the kings. He had his assistants; and it was necessary for his wife to be of irreproachable character, as she also had secret religious services to perform. He was, however, like the other archons, annually appointed, and the election was by lot<sup>o</sup>. The priests and priestesses of the several divinities were for the most part chosen by vote. But the priestesses could be married, and the priests seem by no means to have been excluded by their station from participating in the offices and occupations of citizens. There were some sacerdotal offices which were hereditary in certain families. But the number of them seems to have been but inconsiderable. In Athens the Eumolpidæ possessed the privilege, that the hierophant, or first director of the Eleusinian rites, as well as the other three<sup>p</sup>, should be taken from their family. But the place of hierophant could not be obtained except by a person of advanced years; and those other offices were probably not occupied during life, but frequently assigned anew<sup>q</sup>. How far the same was true in other cases is but seldom related. At Delphi, the first of the Greek oracles, the Pythian priestess was chosen from

<sup>n</sup> Instead of other passages, see the description of the sacrifices which Nestor makes to Minerva, *Odyss.* iii. 430.

<sup>o</sup> See the important passage in DEMOSTHENES in *Neuer.* p. 1379, ed. Reisk.

<sup>p</sup> The daduchus, or torch-bearer; the hieroceryx, or sacred herald; and the epibomius, who served at the altar.

<sup>q</sup> ST. CROIX has collected examples in his *Essay on the Ancient Mysteries*.

among the women of the city<sup>r</sup>, and was cut off from all intercourse with men. It is hardly probable from the violent exertions connected with the delivery of oracles, that the same person could long fill the place. Here, as elsewhere, people were appointed for the service without the temple, some of whom, like the Ion of Euripides, belonged to the god or the temple, and were even educated within its limits. But the service within the temple was performed by the most considerable citizens of Delphi, who were chosen by lot<sup>s</sup>. The sanctuary of Dodona, where the responses of the oracle were made, as at Delphi and in other temples, by priestesses, seems to have belonged to the family of the Selli, of which Homer makes mention<sup>t</sup>; but we have no particular accounts respecting that family.

The regulations respecting priests, proposed by Plato in his laws<sup>u</sup>, show most clearly, that the ideas of the Greeks required that the offices of priests should not long be filled by the same persons. "Let the election of the priests," says he, "be committed to the god, by referring the appointment to lot; those on whom the lot falls must submit to an examination. But each priesthood shall be filled for one year, and no longer, by the same person; he who fills it may not be less than sixty years old. The same rules shall apply to the priestesses."

We infer from all this, that though the regulations respecting the priesthood were not the same in all parts of Greece, that office was commonly filled for a limited time only; was regarded as a place of honour (to which, as to the other mysteries, appointments were made by lot after an examination); and was sub-

<sup>r</sup> EURIPID. *Ion*. v. 1320.

<sup>s</sup> See the important passage in EURIPID. *Ion*, 414: "I," says Ion, speaking to the foreigner on the service of the temple, "I have charge only of the outer part; the interior belongs to them who sit near the tripod, the first of the Delphians, whom the lot selected."

<sup>t</sup> *Iliad*. xv. 235.

<sup>u</sup> PLATO. *de Leg.* l. vi. viii. p. 266. Bip.

jected to the same rotation with the rest. They to whom it was entrusted were taken from the class of active citizens, to which they again returned: and even whilst they were priests, they were by no means withdrawn from the regular business of civil life<sup>x</sup>. The priesthood did not gain even that degree of consistency which it had at Rome; where the priests, though they were not separated from secular pursuits, formed separate colleges, like those of the pontiffs and augurs; and the members of them were chosen for life. Since the priesthood then, among the Greeks in general, and in the several states, never formed a distinct order, it could not possess the spirit of a party, and it was quite impossible for any thing like priestcraft to prevail. Religion and public acts of worship were so far considered holy and inviolable, that they were protected by the state; and thus a degree of intolerance was produced which led even to injustice and cruelty. But we do not find that the priests were peculiarly active in such cases. It was the people which believed itself injured; or a political party, or individual demagogues, who had some particular object in view<sup>y</sup>.

As the priests of the Greeks formed no distinct class in society, it is evident that they could have no such secret system of instructions as was possessed by those of Egypt. No such system can therefore be contrasted with the popular religion; instead of it there were the mysteries; but the initiated were not all of them priests; nor was it necessary for every priest to be initiated into the mysteries. Any person could be admitted to them whose condition in life and behaviour were found to deserve the distinction.

<sup>x</sup> Not even from the duties of war. Callias the daduchus fought at the battle of Marathon in his sacerdotal dress.

<sup>y</sup> See particularly the speech of Andocides on the profanation of the mysteries, delivered on occasion of the well-known accusation of Alcibiades and his friends. Did we not know that a political party was active in that affair, it would hardly seem intelligible to us. It gives a remarkable proof of the ease with which the passions of the Athenians might be roused when any attack was made on the things they deemed sacred.

These regulations led to important consequences. There was in the nation no separate class which claimed an exclusive right to certain branches of scientific and intellectual education, and preserved that exclusive right by means of written characters, intelligible only to themselves. That which ought to be the common property, and is the noblest common property of mankind, was such among the Greeks. And hence the spirit of philosophy was enabled to develop itself with freedom. The most ancient philosophy of the Greeks, as it appeared at first in the Ionic school, perhaps originally stood in close union with religion, and may indeed have proceeded from it; for who does not perceive the close connection between speculations on the elements of things, and the ancient conceptions of the gods as powers or objects of nature? But religion could not long hold philosophy in fetters. It could not prevent the spirit of free inquiry from awakening and gaining strength; and thus it was possible for all the sciences which are promoted by that spirit to assume among the Greeks a decided and peculiar character. In the intellectual culture of the east, all scientific knowledge was connected with religion; but as these were kept separate by the Greeks, science gained among them that independent character which distinguishes the west, and which was communicated to the nations of whom the Greeks were the instructors.

As in Greece the priests never formed a distinct order, and still less a caste, religion never was united with the state to the same extent as in other countries. It was sometimes subservient to public policy, but never became its slave. The dry prosaic religion of the Romans could be used or abused to such purposes; but that of the Greeks was much too poetical. The former seems to have existed only for the sake of the state: and the latter, even when it was useful to the state, appears to have rendered none but voluntary

services. The patricians confined the popular religion of Rome within the strict limits of a system; but in Greece religion preserved its freedom of character.

#### COLONIES FROM ABROAD.

The Hellenic was always the prevalent race in Greece; but it was by no means unmixed. The superior advantages of the country invited foreign emigrations, and its situation facilitated them. Many nations of Thracian, Carian, and Illyrian origin descended at different times from the north by land<sup>z</sup>. These colonists, at least such as remained in the country, were by degrees amalgamated with the Hellenes; but being themselves barbarians, they could not have contributed much towards softening the manners of this people; although the poets of Thrace were not without influence on them. The case was far different with those who came by sea. Greece, as we observed in a former chapter<sup>a</sup>, was surrounded at no great distance by the most cultivated nations of the western world, which were more or less devoted to commerce and the founding of colonies. This is well known to have been the character of the Phœnicians, nor was it otherwise with the inhabitants of Asia Minor; and traces of Egyptian colonies are found both in Europe and Asia.

If no tradition of settlements from these nations on the shores of Greece had been preserved, the existence of such colonies would have seemed highly probable, independently of direct evidence. In truth however we are so far from being without accounts of this kind, that they have been preserved with much greater accuracy than the remoteness of the time and the condition of the nation would have authorised us to expect.

<sup>z</sup> Their names are mentioned by STRABO, l. vii. p. 222. Casaub.

<sup>a</sup> Compare the end of chap. I.

The memory of them could not become extinct, for their consequences were too lasting; and though events which for so long a time were preserved by nothing but tradition, are differently related and sometimes highly coloured, the critical student of history can hardly make any valid objections against their general truth, if the accounts of them are understood in the sense which is required by the mythical language of high antiquity. In this language the names of individual leaders are used instead of the races which they were supposed to lead: a series of events of the same kind, or of migrations, is represented as a single event or a single migration: and to this is applied what was only true of several. The first of the foreign colonies which are mentioned as having arrived by sea, is that which, under the direction of Cecrops, came from Sais in Lower Egypt to Attica<sup>b</sup>; fifty years afterwards, Danaus led his colony from Chemmis in Upper Egypt to Argos in the Peloponnesus. These emigrations took place at the period at which, according to the most probable chronological calculation, the great revolutions in Egypt were effected by the expulsion of the Arabian nomads; and the kingdom was restored to its liberty and independence; a period in which emigrations were at least not improbable. The colony which, as Herodotus relates, was brought by Cadmus, together with the alphabet, from Phœnicia to Greece<sup>c</sup>,

<sup>b</sup> This is generally placed at 1550, B. C. The immigration of Cecrops from Egypt has been rendered very doubtful by the investigations of MÜLLER, *Orchomenos*, p. 106, on the ground that no writer before Theopomitus mentions it. Theopomitus must however have followed some earlier authority. That the belief in an affinity with the Egyptians continued at Athens down to the time of Solon, appears to be certain from the narrative of PLATO in the *Timæus*, vol. ix. p. 293, ed. Bipont. Further researches as to the influence of Egypt on Greece, about which opinions are now so divided, will probably lead to the result, that the truth lies in the middle between both. If narrowness of territory, over-population, and political revolutions are the most frequent causes of emigration, there is no country of antiquity in which they conspired to exercise so strong an influence as Egypt: especially at the very time where the emigration of Cecrops is placed, during the dominion, and at the expulsion of the Hyscos from Lower Egypt.

<sup>c</sup> HEROD. v. 58.

needs no farther proof, when we learn how extensive were the colonies of that nation; we are only astonished that we hear of only one in Greece; since the common course of things would rather lead us to expect a continued emigration, such as took place in the islands, which became almost entirely Phœnician. This difficulty however is removed, if Cadmus is considered not as a historical personage, but as a symbol of the Phœnician colonies in Greece: although with such ancient and precise statements as those of Herodotus respecting Cadmus, the common opinion cannot be so easily abandoned. Nor should we forget the establishment made by Pelops of Lydia in the peninsula which bears his name<sup>d</sup>. That also was occasioned by the events of war. Tantalus, the father of Pelops, having been driven from Lydia by Ilus king of Troy, sought and found in Argos a place of refuge for himself and his treasures.

Yet there have been very different opinions as to the amount of influence which the emigration of those foreign colonists had on the civilization of the Greeks: and more have denied than have conceded, that such an influence was exerted. Where cultivated nations make establishments in the vicinity of barbarians, it would be wrong to infer directly the civilization of the latter, unless it be confirmed by distinct evidence. The aborigines of America have been for more than two centuries the immediate neighbours of civilized Europeans, and yet how little have they learned from them! And if doubts were entertained in the case of the Greeks, it was chiefly because their whole national advancement was so remarkably different from that of those eastern nations, that they could hardly seem much indebted to the latter.

Yet the testimony of the Greeks themselves proves such an influence too clearly to be doubted. Cecrops

<sup>d</sup> STRABO, p. 292.

is expressly mentioned as having first established domestic union among the inhabitants of Attica, by the introduction of regular marriages ; and as having built the citadel which afterwards bore his name. The same is true of the citadel which Cadmus built at Thebes ; and if we interpret the account of Herodotus respecting the introduction of the alphabet by him, to mean only that the Greeks were indebted for it to the Phoenicians, (which on the whole can hardly be doubted,) the case would not be changed. And if Pelops not only emigrated to Argos with his treasures, but gave his name to the peninsula, the facts admit of no other interpretation than that his emigration was productive of the most important consequences.

Still farther. These foreigners not only were princes themselves, but made the royal power hereditary in their families. The earliest kings of Attica, Pandion, Ægeus, Theseus, were all descended from the house of Cecrops, though only by the female side. Perseus and his heroic family sprung in like manner from the family of Danaus. When we name Cadmus, we remember at the same time his descendants, the favourites of the tragic muse, Laius, Oedipus, Eteocles, and Polynices, the rulers of Thebes. But the descendants of Pelops, the house of the Atridae, excelled all the rest in fame as in misfortunes. Thus the traditional history of the nation was principally dependent on those foreign families ; they were not only the most ancient rulers, but the memory of them continued to live in the mouths of the people from age to age, till the tragic poets gave them immortality. It is impossible that such a continued dominion of those families should have had no influence on the nation. To assert it would be to assert that which is inconsistent with the natural progress of things.

While these migrations seem to have been occasioned by political causes, others had their origin in religion. In modern times the savage nature of barbarians has

been tamed by missions; but although antiquity knew and could know none such, it is certain that in early times political and mercantile objects were frequently connected with sanctuaries and oracles. Greece received its colonies of priests; by which we mean the establishments of temples by foreigners, who brought with them their own peculiar forms of worship. The Homeric hymn to Apollo affords a remarkable proof that such institutions were entirely in the spirit of the ancient Greeks. When the Pythian god was establishing his oracle at Delphi, he beheld on the sea a merchant-ship from Crete; this he directs to Crissa, and appoints the foreigners the servants of his newly-established sanctuary, near which they settled and abode<sup>e</sup>. When this story, which we would not affirm to be historically true, is stripped of the language of poetry, it can only mean that a Cretan colony founded the temple and oracle of Delphi. And the account given by Herodotus of the Egyptian origin of the oracle of Dodona ceases to surprise us<sup>f</sup>, although that oracle owed its establishment to another cause, viz. the Phœnician slave trade, by means of which two consecrated women were carried, the one to Ammonium in Libya, the other to Dodona. If we knew more certainly who the Selli were, who are thought to have been a branch of the Pelasgians, and are stated by Homer<sup>g</sup> to have been the servants of the god, and in possession of the oracle, we should probably be able to say more than we now can respecting its history. That it was of Egyptian origin is certain, not only from the sacred traditions of Dodona, but also from those of Egypt. It was impossible for these settlements to assume in Greece the appearance which they bore in Africa. The character of the country and the spirit of the people were alike opposed to it; for though the popular religion in Greece was not wholly

<sup>e</sup> HOMER, *Hymn. in Apoll.* 390 sqq.

<sup>f</sup> HEROD. ii. 54.

<sup>g</sup> IL. xvi. 234.

unconnected with politics, the government having never, as in Egypt, been founded upon religion, never therefore made a temple its central point. But those settlements continued as oracles, of which the Greeks stood in need both in public and private life.

Similar sacred institutions arose very early on several of the islands round Greece, and were transplanted from them to the continent. Those of Crete and Samothrace were the most considerable. The first of these islands occupies, in many points of view, a very important place in the most ancient history of Grecian civilization; but the civilization which sprung up in Crete, seems rather to have produced early blossoms than late fruits. All that we know of the glory of Crete belongs to the age of Homer and the preceding times<sup>b</sup>. The period in which they cleared the sea of pirates; exercised supremacy over the islands, and a part of the country on the shore even of Attica; and received their laws from Minos, the familiar friend of Jove, belongs to so remote an age, that it affords less room for certainty than for conjecture. But Crete is represented by Homer as so flourishing, that hardly a country on the continent could be compared with it<sup>i</sup>. The situation of this large island can alone serve to explain how it came to precede the mainland of Greece in social advancement. It lay at almost equal distances from Egypt, Phoenicia, and Greece. If it was, in fact, the country of brass and iron, and if these metals were first manufactured there<sup>k</sup>, the obscurity which covers the oldest tradition would be at once removed. It appears, however, that this notion has arisen from a confusion of the Phrygian or Asiatic with the Cretan Ida, and that many statements which properly belonged to the former, have been transferred to the

<sup>b</sup> See MEURSIUS, *Creta, Cyprus, Ichodus*, 1675.

<sup>i</sup> Crete awes the circling waves, a fruitful soil,  
And ninety cities crown the seaborn isle.

Od. xix. 172 sqq. in POPE, 196 sqq.

<sup>k</sup> The chief passage is Diod. i. p. 381.

latter mountain<sup>1</sup>. The prevailing rocks in Crete contain no iron or brass<sup>m</sup>, and Crete has therefore been wrongly considered as the native place of these metals. They occur, however, in the Phrygian Ida : and from the accounts of Strabo, it appears that the mythical persons, to whom tradition ascribes the first discovery and fabrication of iron, the Dactyli and Curetes, were supposed to have originally tenanted this latter mountain<sup>n</sup>. Their worship was however carried over to Crete, and with it the forging of iron ; which, even if not of native origin in Crete, could be easily introduced from Asia Minor and Cyprus. That this early metallurgy was afterwards combined with a worship, which produced sacred rites and mysteries<sup>o</sup>, will appear natural, when we consider the origin of the ancient elementary religions. As far as we can judge, this immigration of the Dactyli and Curetes into Crete took place before the age of Minos<sup>p</sup> ; and if the manufacture of iron and brass retained its place there, it affords an easy solution of the various migrations of Pelasgians, Hellenes, and Phœnicians to this island<sup>q</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> See HOECK's *Kreta*, vol. i.

<sup>m</sup> HOECK, ib. p. 42 ; and the Appendix by HAUSMANN on the *Geology of Crete*, p. 443.

<sup>n</sup> STRABO, p. 725 ; and HOECK, ib. p. 284.

<sup>o</sup> DIOD. i. p. 381. We may compare the various superstitions of the German miners.

<sup>p</sup> HOECK, vol. i. p. 359 ; Appendix i.

<sup>q</sup> These are enumerated in the order of time by DIOD. i. p. 382. That there is no proof of any immigration from Egypt has been shown by HOECK, ib. p. 52.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE HEROIC AGE ; THE TROJAN WAR.

ALTHOUGH the history of the early progress of the Greek nation is imperfect and fragmentary, the progress itself is certain. In the age which we best designate in the spirit of the nation by the name of the *heroic age*, and which extends from about the thirteenth to the eleventh century before the Christian era, we find them arrived at a far higher degree of civilization, than that of which, by their own accounts, they were possessed before. The poet who delineates them in this stage is never untrue to the poetic character; and yet Homer was regarded even by the ancients as of historical authority; and, to a certain point, deserved to be so regarded. Truth was his object in his accounts and descriptions, as far as it can be the object of a poet, and even in a greater degree than was necessary, when he distinguishes the earlier and later times or ages. He is the best source of information respecting the heroic age; and while that source is so copious, we need not have recourse to any other authority.

When we compare the Greeks of Homer with those of later ages, we immediately perceive a remarkable difference, to which we must at once direct our attention. His Greeks, to whatever race they belong, are all equal in point of civilization. With him, the Thessalian differs in nothing from the inhabitant of the Peloponnesus, nor the Ætolian from the Boeotian and Athenian; the only points of difference which he marks are personal, or at most result from the greater

or less extent of the several territories. Hence we infer, that the causes which afterwards gave the inhabitants of the eastern part of Greece so great an advantage over those of the west, had not then begun to operate. There must rather have been some causes of general influence, to produce that early progress; and therefore we have less reason to fear that we were mistaken in assigning the first place among them to religion.

Yet religion had no influence in exciting and developing the heroic spirit, which was the characteristic of that period. In the latter part of the middle ages, which may be called the heroic or chivalrous age of the christians, a devotional spirit formed a prominent feature in the character of a knight: but nothing like this is to be found among the Greeks. The Grecian heroes always preserve a belief in the gods; are intimately and directly united with them; are sometimes persecuted and sometimes protected by them; but they do not fight for their religion like the christian knights. Such an idea could never occur to them; for their notion of their gods did not admit of it. And here we remark one great point of difference between the Grecian and christian heroic character. A second, to which we shall return directly, results from the different condition of the female sex. But another prominent feature is common to both; the propensity to extraordinary and bold undertakings, not only at home, but in foreign lands, in countries beyond the sea, and of which tradition had, for the most part, spread none but indistinct accounts. This propensity was first awakened by the early emigrations of the Greeks. But the exploits of the ancient heroes among the Greeks, Meleager, Tydeus, and others, before the time of Hercules and Jason, were performed at home; and even those which are said to have been performed by Hercules out of Greece, are probably later fictions, invented at the time when his name was first added to

the number of the Argonauts, and the Grecian Hercules was confounded with the Phœnician. Adventures in foreign regions begin with Jason and the Argonautic expedition; and those adventures were destined soon to end in a general union of the Greek nation, for the purpose of carrying on a war beyond the sea.

As far as we can judge amidst the uncertainty of the chronology of that period, this adventurous spirit appears to have been awakened in the age immediately preceding the Trojan war. According to all chronological combinations, we must refer to this period the expedition of the Argonauts and the undertaking of Theseus against Crete; which events happened soon after the dominion of the sea had been gained for that island by Minos. The general condition of Greece at this period explains, in some measure, why the limits of that country began to grow too narrow, and a new theatre for the display of enterprise to be sought for. The whole of Greece, previously to the Trojan war, appears to have enjoyed perfect tranquillity within its own boundaries. The limits of the small districts into which it was divided, seem already to have been definitively established. We hear of no contention respecting them on the part of the princes; and Homer was able to enumerate with precision their several possessions. The war of the Seven against Thebes had its origin in family discord; and the claims of the banished Heraclidæ were not asserted till a later age. It was on the whole a time of internal peace, notwithstanding some interruptions. In such an age there was little opportunity for heroic exploits at home; and what was more natural than that the warlike spirit which was once roused should go in quest of them abroad?

But the situation of the country was such that this could take place only by sea. There was nothing in the north to invite the spirit of enterprise; and the country in that direction was possessed by warlike

nations. On the other hand, the reports which came to the Greeks respecting the lands beyond the sea, were numerous; even though they may have been brought by none but the Phœnicians. The countries and nations which were the chief objects of the voyages of that commercial people, the Cimmerians in the north, the Lotophagi, and the gardens of the Hesperides on the coast of Libya; Sicily with its wonders, the Cyclops, and Scylla and Charybdis; and even Spain with the mighty Geryon and the pillars of Hercules are dimly seen in the earliest Grecian mythology. These traditions did much towards awakening the spirit of adventure, and thus occasioned the Argonautic expedition.

These early voyages, by which so much activity was awakened, and so much energy called into being, were the chief means by which the knowledge of the Greeks was enlarged. This is obvious from those ancient mythological tales, which were thus introduced, and which were the fruit of the increased intercourse with foreign countries. The geography of Homer, limited as it is, not only extends far beyond the bounds of his native land, but seems to aim at discovering the farthest limits of the earth. The ocean stream which flowed round it is mentioned; the regions are named in which the sun has the gates of its rising and setting; even the entrance to the lower world is known. The obscurity in which all this was veiled served but to excite the adventurous spirit, when it had been once aroused, to new undertakings.

The internal political condition of Greece in the heroic age was in one respect similar to that of a later period; and in another essentially different. It was similar in the division into small territories; but it was altogether different in the constitutions of the states.

The division into territories, a result of the variety of the races, was in that age as great, or perhaps greater than in more recent times. The district of

Thessaly alone contained in Homer's time, no less than ten small states, each of which had its prince or leader. In the central part of Greece the Boeotians had five principalities<sup>a</sup>, the Minyans, whose capital was Orchomenus, the Locrians<sup>b</sup>, the Athenians, the Phocians, had each their own ruler. In the Peloponnesus there existed, independent of each other, the kingdoms of Argos, of Mycenæ, of Sparta, of Pylus, that of the Eleans, divided under four heads, and Arcadia. Many of the islands also had their own princes. On the west side, the government of Ulysses embraced, beside Ithaca, the islands of Zacynthus and Cephallene, with Epirus, on the opposite continent. The flourishing island of Crete was governed by Idomeneus; Salamis by Ajax; Eubœa, inhabited by the Abantes, Rhodes, and Cos had their own rulers; Ægina, and probably others of the small islands, belonged to the neighbouring princes.

This political division was therefore, from the earliest times a peculiarity of Greece; and it never ceased to be so. And here it is natural to ask, how it could have continued so long? How happened it, that amidst the early civil wars, and especially the later superiority of the Doric race, the supremacy of an individual state was never established? One principal cause of this is to be found in the natural geographical divisions of the country, which we have described in a former chapter; another, no less important, seems to lie in the internal division of the several races. Even where bodies of the same race made their settlements, they were immediately split into separate states or cities. According to these the troops of soldiers are distinguished in Homer. Proofs of it are found in all parts of his poems, especially in the catalogue of ships. And even if these

<sup>a</sup> *Il.* ii. catalog. nav. where also the passages may be found which serve as proofs of the following statementis.

<sup>b</sup> The Opuntii and Epicnemidii. Homer makes no mention of the Ozolæ.

towns stood under one common head, they were still united only by a feeble bond. The germ of division was deeply fixed even in those earlier times; and as it unfolded, it was destined to affect the whole subsequent political condition of Greece.

Yet though the divisions of the country were thus numerous, the forms of government were then entirely different from those of later times. We meet with no governments but those of princes or kings; there were then no republics; and yet republicanism was eventually to decide the political character of Greece. These monarchical constitutions, if that name may be applied to them<sup>c</sup>, were rather outlines of constitutions than regular finished forms of government. They were either founded by ruling families which sprung up in the several races, or by the leaders of foreign colonies, who were able to secure to themselves and their posterity the dominion over the original possessors of the land. The families of Peleus, Cadmus, Pelops, and others have already been mentioned. The princes of later times were always anxious to strengthen their title by tracing their lineage to one of the ancient heroes or gods; and Alexander himself sought the confirmation of his own descent from the temple of Ammon. But though much depended on descent, we learn from observing those ancient families, that it was necessary, not only that the founder of the family should be a hero, but, if its elevation was to be preserved, that many heroes like him should arise among his posterity. For this the houses of Pelops and Cadmus were the most illustrious. But only certain branches of the family of Hercules, the first of Grecian heroes, were remembered by the nation, while

<sup>c</sup> [The constitutions of the early Greek states described in the Homeric poems, were not, as the author himself proceeds to show, monarchical: they were in fact republican, only the number of persons sharing the supreme power was not so great as in the republics of later times, and a larger proportion of authority and dignity belonged to the prince at the head of the state. See MÜLLER's *Dorians*, vol. ii. p. 5. E.]

others passed into oblivion. The Greeks paid respect to birth, yet they never attributed every thing to it; and though in the republican times the noble families were preserved distinct from the rest, their superiority seldom depended on birth alone; nor was any line drawn between them and the rest of the people, such as divided the patricians from the plebeians in the early period of Roman history. The correct judgment of the Greeks is observable in this, as in so many other things. The respect for their illustrious families was continued in the recollection of their actions; but the descendants were not long permitted to live on the fame of their forefathers.

The constitutions of the heroic age were the result of circumstances and wants which were felt. Esteem for the ruling families secured to them the government, but their power was not strictly hereditary. Princes were not much more than the first amongst equals; and even the latter were sometimes denominated princes<sup>d</sup>. The son had commonly the precedence over others in the succession; but his claim was measured by his personal qualifications for the station<sup>e</sup>. It was his first duty to command in war; and he could not do this unless he was himself distinguished for courage and strength. His privileges in peace were not great. He convened the popular assembly, which was chiefly, if not exclusively, composed of the older and more distinguished citizens<sup>f</sup>. Here the king had his own seat; the ensign of his dignity was a sceptre or staff. He had the right of addressing the assembly, which was done standing. In all important affairs he was bound to consult the people. In addition to this he sometimes acted as judge<sup>g</sup>, but not always; for the

<sup>d</sup> As in *Odyss.* viii. 41, the στηπτοῦχοι βασιλῆς of Ithaca.

<sup>e</sup> Observe the description of the situation of Telemachus in this respect, *Odyss.* i. 392.

<sup>f</sup> Compare the description of the assembly of Phaeacians, *Odyss.* viii.

<sup>g</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iii. 14. Στρατηγὸς γὰρ ἦν καὶ δικαστὴς ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ τῶν πρὸς θεοὺς κύριος.

administration of justice was often committed to an assembly of the elders<sup>h</sup>. Nothing was known of particular taxes paid to the king. His privileges consisted in a piece of land, and a larger part of the booty. Excepting this, he derived his support from his own possessions and the produce of his fields and herds. The preservation<sup>i</sup> of his dignity required an almost unbounded hospitality. His house was the place of assembly for persons of the upper class, who almost always sat at table with him. To turn away strangers who asked for shelter, or seemed to stand in need of it, would have been an unexampled outrage<sup>j</sup>.

Greece, even in those times, was a thickly peopled and well cultivated country. What a crowd of cities is enumerated by Homer! And we must not imagine these to have been open towns with scattered habitations. The epithets applied to them frequently prove the reverse. They are in part surrounded with walls; have gates and regular streets<sup>k</sup>. Yet the houses stood by themselves; having in front a court, and in the rear a garden<sup>l</sup>. Such, at least, were the houses of the chief persons. Others appear to have stood directly on the street, without any court in front. In the middle of the city there was a public square, or market-place; the common place of assembly for the citizens, whether on solemn occasions, or for deliberation, or courts of justice, or any other purpose. It was surrounded with seats of stone, on which the distinguished men were wont, on such occasions, to take their places<sup>m</sup>. No trace is to be found of any pavement in the streets.

<sup>h</sup> See e. g. the figures on the shield of Achilles, *Il.* xviii. 504.

<sup>i</sup> How warmly Menelaus reproaches Etoneus for proposing to send the strangers somewhere else, *Odyss.* iv. 31.

<sup>k</sup> e. g. Athens with broad streets (*εὐρυάγυα*), *Odyss.* vii. 8 : Gortys with strong walls (*τειχισθεστα*) ; and others.

<sup>l</sup> Thus the palace of Menelaus, *Odyss.* ii. ; and of Alcinous, *Odyss.* vii. Others on the street, *Il.* xviii. 496.

<sup>m</sup> The city of the Phœcians, *Odyss.* vii. gives proof of all this.

The different branches of agriculture had already made great progress. Property in land was universal ; of which the boundaries were fixed by measurement, and often designated by stones<sup>n</sup>. The poet describes to us the various labours of farming, ploughing, both with oxen and mules, sowing, reaping, binding the sheaves, and treading out the corn by oxen on the threshing-floor. Nor does he omit to mention the culture of the grape, the tilling of gardens, and the various duties of the herdsmen<sup>o</sup>. It may be doubted whether the soil was much better cultivated in the most flourishing period of Greece.

The houses of the heroes were large and spacious, and at the same time suited to the climate. The court was surrounded by a gallery, round which the bed-chambers were built. The entrance from the court to the hall was direct, which was the common place of resort<sup>p</sup>. Moveable seats (*θρόνοι*) stood along the sides of the walls. Everything shone with brass. On one side was a place of deposit, where the arms were kept. In the back ground was the hearth, and the seat for the lady of the mansion, when she made her appearance below. Several steps led from thence to a higher gallery, near which were the chambers of the women, where they were employed in household labours, especially in weaving. Several outhouses for the purpose of grinding and baking were connected with the house ; others for the common habitations of the male and female slaves ; and also stables for the horses<sup>q</sup>. The stalls for cattle were commonly in the fields.

Astonishment is excited by the abundance of metals, both of the precious and baser kinds, with which the mansions were adorned, and of which the household

<sup>n</sup> *Il.* xii. 421, xxi. 405.

<sup>o</sup> I need only call to mind the figures on the shield of Achilles, *Il.* xviii. 540 sqq.

<sup>p</sup> The houses of Menelaus and Alcinous best illustrate this style of architecture ; although the description of that of Ulysses is more minute.

<sup>q</sup> Thus in the house of Menelaus, *Odyss.* iv. 40.

utensils were made <sup>r</sup>. The walls glittered with them ; the seats were made of them. Water for washing was presented in golden ewers on silver salvers ; the benches, arms, utensils were ornamented with them. Even if we suppose that much, called golden, was only gilded, we still have reason to ask, whence this wealth in precious metals ? Homer gives us a hint respecting the silver, when he speaks of it as belonging to Alybe, in the land of the Halizones <sup>s</sup>. Most of the gold probably came from Lydia, where this metal in later times was so abundant, that the Greeks were supplied with nearly all they used from that country. There was no coined money <sup>t</sup>, but the precious metals appear to have been chiefly, if not exclusively used in traffic as means of exchange : the manufacturing of them also seems to have been one of the chief branches of mechanical industry. Proofs of this are found in the preparation of arms and utensils. We need but call to mind the shield of Achilles, the torchbearing statues in the house of Alcinous <sup>u</sup>, the enamelled figures on the clasp of Ulysses' mantle <sup>x</sup>, etc. But it is difficult to say how far these things were made by the Greeks, or procured by exchange from abroad. As the poet commonly describes them to be the works of Vulcan, it is at least clear that manufactures of this kind were somewhat rare, and in part foreign <sup>y</sup>. Gold was afterwards wrought in Asia Minor, especially in Lydia ; all labour in brass and iron seems, as we remarked above, to have been first brought to perfection among the Greeks in Crete.

These metallic fabrics appear to have limited the

<sup>r</sup> Especially in the mansion of Menelaus.

<sup>s</sup> *Iliad*, ii. catalog. v. 364. Without doubt in the Caucasian chain of mountains ; even if the Halizones and the Chalybes were not the same.

<sup>t</sup> This was probably one of the chief reasons why so much of it was manufactured.

<sup>u</sup> *Odys.* vii. 100.

<sup>x</sup> *Odys.* xix. 225 sqq.

<sup>y</sup> As e. g. the silver goblet received by Menelaus from the king of Sidon, *Odys.* iv. 615.

early progress of the fine arts. We find no traces of painting, and none of marble statues. But these metal statues imply practice in drawing; for we hear not only of figures, but also of expression in their positions and motions<sup>z</sup>.

The art of weaving, the chief occupation of the women, was even then carried to a high degree of perfection. The cloths were of wool and linen; it is hard to decide how far cotton was in those times manufactured in Greece<sup>a</sup>. Yet garments of foreign manufacture, those of Egypt and Sidon, were esteemed the most beautiful<sup>b</sup>. The dress was decent, but free. The female sex were not accustomed to conceal the face, but they were clad in long robes; both sexes wore an under garment, over which the broad upper garment was thrown<sup>c</sup>.

The internal regulations of families were simple, but not without those peculiarities which are a natural consequence of the institution of slavery. Polygamy was not directly authorised; but the sanctity of marriage was not considered as violated by the intercourse of the husband with female slaves. The noble characters of Andromache and of Penelope exhibit, each in its way, models of elevated conjugal affection. It is more difficult for us, with our feelings, to understand the seduced and the returning Helen; and yet if we compare Helen, the beloved of Paris in the Iliad<sup>d</sup>, with Helen, the spouse of Menelaus in the Odyssey<sup>e</sup>, we

<sup>z</sup> Beside the description of the shield of Achilles, see especially *Odyss.* xix. 228 sqq.

<sup>a</sup> See particularly the description of the dress of Ulysses, *Odyss.* xiv. 225 sqq. The mantle (*χλαῖνα*), rough to the touch, was, without doubt, of wool; but the under garment (*χιτών*) was probably neither woollen nor linen.

Fine as a filmy web beneath it shone  
A vest, that dazzl'd like a cloudless sun.

<sup>b</sup> As e. g. *Il.* vi. 290.

<sup>c</sup> The passages are collected in FEITH. *Ant. Homer.* iii. cap. 7.

<sup>d</sup> In the third book.

<sup>e</sup> *Odyss.* iv. and xv.

find truth and harmony in the character which could err indeed, but never lose the generosity and nobleness of its nature. It is a woman, who, having become in youth the victim of sensuality, first repented, and returned to reason, before she was compelled to do so by age. Even after her return from Troy she was still most beautiful<sup>f</sup> (for who would think of counting her years?). And yet even then the two sexes stood to each other in the same relation which continued in later times. The wife was a housewife, and nothing more. Even the sublime Andromache, after that parting, which will draw tears as long as there are eyes which can weep and hearts which can feel, is sent back to the apartments of the women, to superintend the labours of the maid-servants<sup>g</sup>. Still we observe in her a conjugal love of an elevated character. In other instances love has reference, both with mortals and with immortals, to sensual enjoyment; although in the noble and uncorrupted vestal characters, as in the amiable Nausicaa, it was united with that bashfulness which accompanies maiden youth. But we meet with no trace of those elevated feelings, that romantic love, as it is improperly termed, which results from a higher regard for the female sex. That love and that regard are traits peculiar to the Germanic nations, a result of the spirit of gallantry which was a leading feature in the character of chivalry, but which we vainly look for in Greece. Yet in this respect the Greek stands between the east and the west. Although he was never wont to revere women as beings of a higher order, he did not, like the Asiatic, imprison them by troops in a haram.

The progress which had been made in social life is visible in nothing more distinctly, (except the relative situation of the sexes,) than in the tone of conversation among men. A solemn dignity belonged to it even in

<sup>f</sup> *Odyss.* iv. 121.

<sup>g</sup> *Il.* vi. 490.

common intercourse; the style of salutation and address is connected with certain forms; the epithets with which the heroes honoured each other were so adopted into the language of intercourse, that they are not unfrequently applied even where the language of reproach is used. Let it not be said that this is merely the language of epic poetry. The poet never could have employed it, if its original, and a taste for it, had not already existed. If the tone of intercourse is a measure of the social, and, to a certain degree, of the moral improvement of a nation, the Greeks of the heroic age were already vastly elevated above their earlier savage state.

To complete the picture it is necessary to speak of their military system. The heroic age of the Greeks, considered from this point of view, exhibits a mixture of savageness and magnanimity, and the first outlines of a law of nations. The enemy who had been slain was not secure against outrage, and yet the corpse was not always abused<sup>h</sup>. The conquered party offered a ransom; and it depended on the victor to accept or refuse it. The arms, both of attack and defence, were of iron or brass. No hero appeared, like Hercules of old, with a club and lion's skin for spear and shield. The art of war, so far as it relates to the position and erecting of fortified camps, seems to have been first invented at the siege of Troy<sup>i</sup>. In other respects everything depended on the goodness of the arms and accoutrements, together with personal courage and strength. As the great majority of the combatants were without defensive armour, and as only a few were completely equipped, one armed man outweighed a host of the rest. But only the leaders were thus armed; and they, standing on their chariots of war (for cavalry was still unknown), fought with each other

<sup>h</sup> See e. g. *Il.* vi. 417.

<sup>i</sup> See on this subject, on which we believe we may be brief, the *Excursus* of HEYNE to the 6th, 7th, and 8th books of the Iliad.

in the space between the armies. If they were victorious they spread panic before them ; and it became easy for them to break through the ranks. But we will pursue no farther the description of scenes which every one prefers to read in the poet himself.

As the crusades were the fruit of the great revolution in the social condition of the west, so the Trojan war resulted from the same causes in Greece. It was necessary that a fondness for adventures in foreign lands should be awakened ; expeditions by sea, like that of the Argonauts, be attended with success ; and a union of the heroes, as in that and the march against Thebes, be first established, before such an undertaking could become practicable. But now it resulted so naturally from the whole condition of things, that, though its object might have been a different one, it must have taken place even without a Helen.

The expedition against Troy, like the crusades, was a voluntary undertaking on the part of those who joined in it ; and this circumstance had an influence on all its internal arrangements. The leaders of the several bands were voluntary followers of the Atridae, and could therefore depart from the army at their own pleasure. Agamemnon was only the first among the first. It is more difficult to ascertain the precise relation of the leaders to their people ; and he who should undertake to describe everything minutely, would be most sure of falling into error. There were certainly control and obedience. The troops follow their leaders and leave the battle with them. But much even of this seems to have been voluntary ; and the spirit of the age allowed no such severe discipline as exists in modern armies. None but a Thersites could have received the treatment of Thersites.

This undertaking, begun and successfully terminated by united exertions, kindled the national spirit of the Greeks. On the fields of Asia the several races had for the first time been assembled, for the first time sa-

luted each other as brethren. They had fought and had conquered in company. Yet something was still wanting to preserve the flame which was just blazing up. The assistance of the muse was needed to commemorate in words those events of which the memory will never die away, but will rather increase in each successive age.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE PERIOD FOLLOWING THE HEROIC AGE. EMIGRATIONS. ORIGIN OF REPUBLICAN FORMS OF GOVERNMENT, AND THEIR CHARACTER.

LIKE the age of chivalry in western Europe, the heroic age of the Greeks began and ended without our being able to define either period by an exact date. Such a phenomenon is the result of causes which are rooted deeply and of continuing influence, and it neither suddenly comes to maturity, nor suddenly disappears. The heroic age was not immediately terminated by the Trojan war; yet it was during that period in its greatest glory<sup>a</sup>. It was closely united with the political constitution of the times; the princes of the several tribes were the first of the heroes. When this constitution was changed, the heroic age could not continue. No new undertaking was begun which was so splendidly executed and finished. Although, therefore, heroic characters may still have arisen, as in the times of Achilles and Agamemnon, no similar career of honour was open to them; they were not celebrated in song like the Atridae and their companions; and though they may have gained the praise of their contemporaries, they did not live, like the latter, in the memory of succeeding generations.

In the age succeeding the Trojan war, several events took place which prepared and introduced an entire revolution in the domestic, and still more in the public, life of the Greeks. The result of these revolutions was the origin and general prevalence of republican forms of

<sup>a</sup> HESION limits his fourth age, the age of heroes, to the times immediately before and after the Trojan war, *Op. et Dies* 156 sqq.

government among them; and this decided the whole subsequent character of the political institutions which distinguished them as a nation.

It is still possible for us to show the general causes of this great change; but when we remember that these events took place before Greece had produced an historian, and when tradition was the only authority, we must give up all expectation of gaining perfect and continuous historical accounts; and must acknowledge that we can hardly know more of them than Thucydides.

"The emigrations of the different races," says this historian<sup>b</sup>, "did not end with the Trojan war. The long continuance of the war produced many changes; in many cities disturbances were excited, which occasioned the banished parties to found new settlements. The Boeotians, driven from Arne in Thessaly, took possession of their new country in the sixtieth year after the fall of Troy; in the eightieth, the Dorians, led by the Heraclidae, conquered the Peloponnesus." We have already observed what great revolutions were produced by this last event. A new tribe, till then of slight importance, was extended and became the most powerful. But still greater changes were to come; the race of the Hellenes were destined to extend to the east and west far beyond the limits of their ancient country. "When Greece," continues Thucydides, "after a long interval, at length became settled, and assumed a more regular appearance, it sent out colonies: Athens, to Ionia in Asia Minor, and to a great part of the islands of the Archipelago; the Peloponnesians, chiefly to Italy and Sicily; all which settlements were not made till after the Trojan war."

The views of the Greeks could not but be enlarged by the Trojan war. They had become acquainted with the coasts of Asia, those lands so highly favoured by nature; and the recollection of them never died away.

<sup>b</sup> THUCYD. i. 12.

When the new internal storms followed, and almost all the Greek tribes were driven from their places of abode, it is not remarkable that the coasts of Asia should have attracted the emigrating parties. Since the downfall of Troy, no new kingdom had been established there; no nation of the country was strong enough to prevent the settlement of the foreigners. Thus, in the course of not more than a century<sup>c</sup>, the western coast of Asia Minor was occupied by a chain of Grecian cities, extending from the Hellespont to the borders of Cilicia. Æolians, conducted by the descendants of the fallen house of the Atridæ, established their residence in the vicinity of the ruins of Troy, on the coast of Mysia, in the most fertile region known to those times<sup>d</sup>, and on the opposite island of Lesbos; on the continent they built twelve cities, and on Lesbos Mytilene, which now gives its name to the whole island. Smyrna, the only one which has preserved a part of its splendour, and Cumæ, exceeded all the rest on the mainland. Æolis was bounded on the south by Ionia, a region so called from the twelve Ionian cities, which were built by the Ionians, who had been expelled from their ancient country. They also occupied the neighbouring islands of Chios and Samos. If Æolis could boast of superior fertility, the Ionian climate was considered by the Greeks as the mildest and most delightful<sup>e</sup>. Of these cities, Miletus, Ephesus, and Phœcæa became flourishing commercial towns; and sent out many colonies, extending from the shores of the Black sea and lake Maeotis to the coasts of Gaul and Iberia. Neither were the Dorians content with their conquest of the Peloponnesus; large bodies of them thronged to Asia; Cos, and the wealthy Rhodes, as well as the cities of Halicarnassus and Cnidos, were peopled by them. In this manner, as the line of cities planted by the Grecians ascended the Macedonian and Thracian

<sup>c</sup> From about 1130 B. C.

<sup>d</sup> HEROD. i. 149.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. i. 142.

coast to Byzantium, the *Ægean* sea was encircled with Grecian colonies, and its islands were covered with them. But the mother country seems soon to have been filled again ; and as the east offered no more room, the emigrants wandered to the west. At a somewhat later period, but with hardly less success, the coasts of Lower Italy, which soon took the name of Magna Græcia, and those of Sicily, were occupied by Dorians, Achæans, and Ionians<sup>f</sup>. On the gulf of Tarentum, not only the city of that name, but Croton and Sybaris, soon rose to a degree of population and wealth bordering on the fabulous ; whilst the chain of towns extended by way of Rhegium and Pæstum as far as Cumæ and Naples. These settlements were still more numerous on the coasts of Sicily, from Messana and the unrivalled Syracuse to the proud Agrigentum. And in the now desolate Barca, on the coast of Libya, Cyrene with its colonies enjoyed considerable prosperity, and proved that Greeks remained true to their origin even in Africa.

We reserve for another chapter the consideration of the flourishing condition and various consequences of these colonies. But whilst the territory of the Greeks and their field of vision were thus enlarged, it was not possible for their political condition to remain unchanged. Freedom flourishes in colonies. Ancient usage cannot be preserved, cannot altogether be renewed as at home. The former bonds of attachment to the soil and ancient customs were broken by the voyage ; the mind felt itself more free in the new country ; new strength was required for the necessary exertions ; and those exertions were animated by success. Where every man lives by the labour of his hands, equality arises, even where it did not originally exist. Each day is fraught with new experience ;

<sup>f</sup> Especially between 800 and 700 B. C. Yet single colonies were earlier established.

*the necessity of common defence is more felt in lands where the new settlers find ancient inhabitants desirous of being free from them.* Need we wonder, then, if the authority of the founders, even where it had originally subsisted, soon gave way to the cause of liberty?

Similar phenomena are observable in the mother country. The annihilation of so many of the ruling houses in the Trojan war and its immediate consequences, would have produced them even without internal troubles. How then could the ancient order of things be restored after so great revolutions and such changes in the settlements of nearly all the tribes? The heroic age disappeared, and with it the supremacy of the princes: and even when heroes such as Aristomenes came forward, they remind us rather of adventurers than of the sublime pictures of Homer. On the other hand, the intercourse and trade with the colonies were continued on all sides; for, according to the Grecian custom, the mother country and her colonies were never strangers to each other: and the former soon had a lesson to learn of the latter.

A new order of things was the necessary consequence. The ancient ruling families died away of themselves, or lost their power. But this did not take place in all or most of the Grecian cities at one time, but very gradually; and to call it a general political revolution in the modern phrase, would excite altogether erroneous conceptions. As far as we can judge from the imperfect accounts which remain of the history of the several states, more than a century elapsed before the change was complete. We cannot fix the period of it in all: it happened, however, in most of them between the years 900 and 700 before Christ; in others, in the two centuries immediately succeeding the Doric migration. In several, as in Athens, it was brought about by degrees. In that city, when the royal dignity was abolished at the death of Co-

drus<sup>g</sup>, archons, differing little from kings, were appointed from his family for life; these were followed by archons chosen for ten years<sup>h</sup>; and these last continued for seventy years, till the annual election of a board of archons finally established a democracy.

The fruit of these changes was the establishment of free constitutions for the cities; which constitutions could prosper only with the increasing prosperity of the towns. Thucydides has described to us, in an admirable manner, the way in which this happened. “In those times,” says he<sup>i</sup> “no important war which could give a great ascendancy to individual states was carried on; the wars which chanced to arise were only with the nearest neighbours.” Though tranquillity was thus sometimes interrupted, the increase of the cities could not be retarded. “But since colonies were established beyond the sea, several of the cities began to apply themselves to navigation and commerce; and the mutual intercourse kept up between the two afforded advantages to each party<sup>k</sup>. The cities,” continues Thucydides, “became more powerful and more wealthy; but then usurpers arose in most of them, who sought only to confirm their own power and enrich their own families; but performed no great exploits, until they were overthrown, not long before the Persian wars, by the Spartans (who, amidst all these disturbances, were never subjected to tyrants) and the Athenians!<sup>l</sup>”

Hence the essential characteristic of the new political form assumed by Greece, was that the free states thus formed were merely cities with their districts, and their constitutions were consequently only forms of city government. This point must never be lost sight of. The districts into which Greece was divided, did not form so many states; but the same province often con-

<sup>g</sup> In 1068 B. C. <sup>h</sup> In 752 B. C. <sup>i</sup> THUCYD. i. 15. <sup>k</sup> Ibid. i. 13.

<sup>l</sup> For the counterpart to the narration of Thucydides we need only call to mind the history of the Italian cities, towards the end of the middle age.

tained as many states as it possessed independent cities; though a whole district sometimes formed the territory of but one city, as Attica of Athens, Laconia of Sparta, etc. and in such a case formed, of course, but one state. Nevertheless it might happen, that the cities of one district, especially if their inhabitants were of kindred tribes, formed confederacies for mutual defence, as the twelve Achæan cities had done. These alliances, however, had reference only to foreign relations; and thus they formed a confederation of cities, but not one state; for each individual city had its own internal constitution, and managed its own concerns. It might also happen, that some one of the cities, on becoming powerful, claimed the sovereignty over the rest: as Thebes over the Boeotian cities. Yet whatever might be the real consequence of such supremacy, it was intended by the Greeks, not only that each state should preserve its internal liberty, but that its submission should be voluntary; although the claims of a supreme city occasionally led to compulsory measures. When Thebes usurped the first rank in Bœotia, Platææ would never acknowledge its sovereignty. The consequences are known from history.

The whole political system of Greece was thus connected with cities and their constitutions; and no one can judge of Grecian history with accuracy, unless he comprehends the spirit of them. The strength of such cities seems to be very limited; but history abounds in examples, which show how far beyond expectation they can rise. They are animated by public spirit, resulting from civil prosperity; and the force of that spirit cannot be expressed in any statistical tables.

## CHAPTER VI.

### HOMER. THE EPIC POETS.

THE heroic age was past before the poets who celebrated it arose. It produced some contemporary with itself; but their fame was eclipsed by those who came after them; and were it not for Homer, the names of Demodocus and Phemius would never have become immortal.

With the Greeks epic poetry had an importance which it possessed among no other people, except perhaps the Hindoos; it was the source of their national education in poetry and the arts. It became so by means of the Homeric poems. But boundless as was the genius of the Ionic bard, a concurrence of favourable circumstances was still needed to prepare the way for his appearance, and to make it possible.

As the poetry of romance was the result of the age of chivalry, so epic poetry was a fruit of the heroic age. This is evident from the picture drawn for us by Homer of the heroic times. The feasts of the heroes, like the banquets of the knights, were ornamented with song. But the more copious the stream is to which it swelled, the more does it deserve to be traced, as far as is possible, to its origin.

Even before the heroic age, we hear of several poets, of Orpheus, Linus, and a few others. But if their hymns were merely invocations and eulogies of the gods, as we must infer from the accounts which have been handed down to us respecting them<sup>a</sup>, no

<sup>a</sup> The extant Orphic hymns have this character. The more ancient ones, if there were such, were nothing else. See PAUSANIAS, ix, p. 770; and the very ancient hymn, preserved by STOBÆUS, Eclog. i. p. 40. ed. Heeren.

similarity seems to have existed between them and the subsequent heroic poetry; although a transition not only became possible, but actually took place, when the actions of the gods were made the subjects of hymns<sup>b</sup>. The heroic poetry, according to all that we know of it, preserved the character of narration; whether those narrations contained accounts of the gods or of heroes<sup>c</sup>; “the actions of gods and heroes, who were celebrated in song.” In the songs of Demodocus and Phemius, the subject is taken from both; the former celebrates as well the loves of Mars and Venus<sup>d</sup>, as the adventures which took place before Troy. The latter class of subjects cannot be more ancient than the heroic age, even though we should esteem the former as much earlier. But that age produced the class of bards who were employed in celebrating the actions of the heroes. They formed a separate class in society; but they stood on an equal footing with the heroes, and are considered as belonging to their number<sup>e</sup>. The gift of song came to them from the gods; it is the muse or Jove himself who inspires them, and teaches them what they should sing<sup>f</sup>. As this idea continually recurs, it is probable that their poetical effusions were often extemporaneous. At least this seems in many cases hardly to admit of a doubt. Ulysses proposes to Demodocus the subject of his song<sup>g</sup>; and the bard, like the modern improvisatori, commences his strains under the influence of the sudden inspiration. We would by no means be understood to assert, that there were none but extemporaneous productions. Certain songs very naturally became favourites, and were kept alive in the mouths of the poets; whilst an infinite number, which were but the offspring of the moment, died away at their birth. But an abundance of songs

<sup>b</sup> The proof of this is found in the Hymns attributed to Homer.

<sup>c</sup> *Odyss.* i. 338.

<sup>d</sup> *Odyss.* viii. 266 sqq.

<sup>e</sup> *Odyss.* viii. 483. Demodocus himself is here called a hero.

<sup>f</sup> *Odyss.* viii. 73. i. 348.

<sup>g</sup> *Odyss.* viii. 492 sqq.

was needed, a variety was required, and the charm of novelty even then enforced its claims.

For novel lays attract our ravish'd ears ;  
But old the mind with inattention hears <sup>b</sup>.

The voice was always accompanied by some instrument. The bard was provided with a harp, on which he played a prelude<sup>i</sup>, to elevate and inspire his mind, and with which he accompanied the song when begun. His voice probably preserved a medium between singing and recitation; the words, and not the melody, were regarded by the listeners; hence it was necessary for him to remain intelligible to all. In countries where nothing similar is found, it is difficult to represent such scenes to the mind; but whoever has had an opportunity of listening to the improvisatori of Italy, can easily form an idea of Demodocus and Phemius.

However imperfect our ideas of the earliest heroic songs may remain after all which the poet has told us, the following positions may be inferred from it. First: The singers were at the same time poets; they sang their own works; there is no trace of their having sung those of others. Again; their songs were either poured forth on the inspiration of the moment, or were only repeated from their memory. In the former case, they were, in the full sense of the word, improvisatori; and in the latter they must necessarily have remained in some measure improvisatori, for they lived in an age which, even if it possessed the alphabet, seems never to have thought of committing poems to writing. The epic poetry of the Greeks did not continue to be a mere extemporaneous effusion; but it seems very probable that such was its origin. And lastly; although the song was sometimes accompanied by a dance illustrative of its subject, imitative gestures are never attributed to the bard himself. For this there were separate

<sup>b</sup> *Odyss.* i. 352.

<sup>i</sup> ἀναβάλλεσθαι, *Odyss.* viii. 266, and elsewhere.

dancers. In this manner epic poetry and dancing were combined; but the union was not essential, and probably took place only at the chanting of sacred hymns<sup>k</sup>. This union was very natural. Under the southern skies of Europe no regular melody is required for the imitative dance; it is only necessary that the time should be distinctly marked. When the bard did this with his lyre, the dancers, as well as himself, had all that they required.

This heroic poetry, which was so closely interwoven with social life that it could be spared at no banquet, was common, no doubt, throughout all Greece. We hear its strains in the island of the Phœaciens, no less than in the dwellings of Ulysses and Menelaus. The poet does not speak of regular contests in song; but we may learn that the spirit of emulation was strong, and that some then believed themselves perfect in their art, from the story of the Thracian Thamyris, who wished to contend with the Muses, and was punished for his daring by the loss of his eyesight, and the art of song<sup>l</sup>.

Epic poetry emigrated with the colonies to the shores of Asia. When we remember that those settlements were made during the heroic age, and that the sons and descendants of those princes, in whose palaces at Argos and Mycenæ its echoes had formerly been heard, were frequently the leaders of those expeditions<sup>m</sup>, this will hardly seem doubtful and still less improbable.

But that epic poetry should have first displayed its full glory in those regions, and should have raised itself to the high station which it obtained, was more than could have been expected.

And yet it was so. Homer appeared. The history of this poet and his works is lost in doubtful

<sup>k</sup> As in the story of the loves of Mars and Venus in the eighth book of the *Odyssey*.

<sup>l</sup> *H. Cat. Nav.* 102.

<sup>m</sup> As Orestes and his descendants.

obscurity ; as is the history of many of the first minds who have done honour to humanity, because they rose amidst darkness. The majestic stream of his song, blessing and fertilizing, flows like the Nile through many lands and nations ; and, like the sources of the Nile, its fountains will ever remain concealed.

It is not our intention to enter anew into these investigations, which probably have already been carried as far as the present state of criticism and learning will admit<sup>a</sup>. The modern inquirers can hardly be reproached with credulity ; for nothing which could be doubted, not even the existence of Homer himself, has been left unquestioned. When once the rotten fabric of ancient belief was examined, no one of the pillars on which it rested could escape inspection. The general result is, that the whole building rested far more on the foundation of tradition than of credible history ; but how far this foundation is secure, is a question as to which different voices will hardly be able to unite.

It seems here of chief importance to expect no more than the nature of things makes possible. If the period of tradition in history is the region of twilight, we should not expect in it perfect light. The creations of genius always seem like miracles, because they are, for the most part, created far out of the reach of observation. If we were in possession of all the historical testimonies, we never could wholly explain the origin of the Iliad and the Odyssey ; for their origin, in all essential points, must have remained the secret of the poet. But we can to a certain extent explain how, under the circumstances of those times, an epic poet could arise ; how he could elevate his mind ; and how he could become of such importance to his nation and to posterity. This is all to which our inquiry should be directed.

<sup>a</sup> In HEYN's *Excursus* to the last book of the Iliad, and WOLF'S *Prolegomena to Homer*.

The age of Homer was, in all probability, that in which the Ionian colonies flourished in the vigour of youth<sup>o</sup>. Their subsequent condition shows that this must have been so; although history has not preserved any particular account on the subject. It is easy to conceive, that in a country highly favoured by nature, many facilities and incentives were also afforded to the poet by the forms of social life, of which song was the companion. But the circumstances of the times afforded many greater advantages to poetical genius.

The glimmerings of tradition were not yet extinguished. The expedition against Troy, and the efforts of the earlier poets, had rather contributed so to mature the traditions, that they offered the noblest subjects for national poems. Before that time, the heroes of the several tribes had been of importance to none but their tribe; but those who were distinguished in the common undertaking against Troy, became heroes of the nation. Their actions and their sufferings awakened a general interest. Add to this, that these actions and adventures had already been celebrated by many of the early bards; and that they had, even then, imparted to the whole of history the poetical character which distinguished it. Time is always needed to mature tradition for the epic poet. The songs of a Phemius and a Demodocus, though the subjects of them were taken from that war, were but the first essays, which died away as the ancient songs have done in which the exploits of the crusaders were commemorated. It was not till three hundred years after the loss of the Holy Land, that the poet appeared who was to celebrate the glory of Godfrey in a manner worthy of the hero; more time had per-

<sup>o</sup> The age of Homer is usually placed about a century after the establishment of those colonies: viz. about 950 B.C. If it be true that Lycurgus, whose laws were made about the year 880, introduced his poems into Sparta, he cannot be of much later date.

haps passed after Achilles and Hector fell in battle, before the Grecian poet secured to them their immortality.

The language no less than the subject had been improved in this age. Although neither all its words nor its phrases were limited in their use by strict grammatical rules, it was by no means awkward or rough. It had for centuries been improved by the poets, and had now become a poetical language. It almost seemed more easy to make use of it in verse than in prose ; and the forms of the hexameter, of which alone the epic poets made use, are extremely simple<sup>p</sup>. The language voluntarily submitted to the poet, and there never was a tongue in which inspiration could pour itself forth with more readiness and ease.

Under such circumstances it is intelligible, that when a sublime poetical genius arose among a people so fond of poetry and song as the Ionians, the age was favourable to him ; although the lofty creations of his mind must always appear wonderful. There are two things which, in modern times, appear most remarkable and difficult of explanation ; how a poet could have first conceived the idea of so extensive a whole as the Iliad and the Odyssey ; and how he could have composed them, how he could have executed works of such extent, and how those works could have been preserved without the aid of writing.

With regard to the first point, criticism has endeavoured to show, and has succeeded in showing, that these poems, especially the Iliad, have by no means that perfect unity which they were formerly believed to possess ; indeed, that many whole pieces have been interpolated or annexed to them : and there hardly exists at present an inquiring scholar, who can persuade himself that we possess them both in the state

<sup>p</sup> How much easier it must have been to make extemporaneous verses in that measure, than in the *ottava rima* of the Italians. And yet the Italian wears its shackles with the greatest ease.

in which they came from the hands of the poet. But notwithstanding the more or less frequent interpolations, each has one primary action ; which, although it is interrupted by frequent episodes, could hardly have been conceived and executed by more than one author; and which does not permit us to consider either of these poems as a mere collection of scattered rhapsodies. It is certainly a gigantic step to raise epic poetry to the unity of the chief action ; but the idea springs from the very nature of a narration, and therefore it did not stand in need of a theory, which was foreign to the age ; genius was able of itself to take this step<sup>q</sup>. Herodotus did something similar in the department of history.

We find it still more difficult to comprehend how works of this extent could have been planned and executed without the aid of an alphabet, and preserved, probably for a long time, till they were finally saved from perishing by being committed to writing. We will not here repeat at large what has already been said by others ; that a class of singers, devoted exclusively to this business, could easily preserve in memory much more ; that the poems were recited in parts, and therefore needed to be remembered only in parts ; and that even in a later age, when the Homeric poems had already been intrusted to writing, the rhapsodists still knew them so perfectly (as we must infer from the Ion

<sup>q</sup> A more plausible objection is, that, even if it be conceded that it was possible to invent and compose such long poems, they would have answered no end, as they were too long to admit of being recited at once. But a reply may be made to this. The Iliad and Odyssey could not indeed be recited at a banquet. But there were public festivals and assemblies which lasted many days, and Herodotus read aloud the nine books of his history, in a succession of days at Olympia. The Iliad and Odyssey, which, when free from interpolations, were, perhaps, much shorter than they now are, may have been recited in the course of several days. And, if we may be permitted to indulge in conjecture, why may they not have been designed for such occasions ? That the Greeks were accustomed to intellectual enjoyments, interrupted and afterwards continued, appears from the Tetralogies of the dramatists in a later age. This is characteristic of a nation, which, even in its pleasures, desired something more than pastime, and always aimed at grandeur and beauty.

of Plato) that they could readily recite any passage which was desired. But let us be permitted to call to mind a fact, which has come to light since the modern inquiries respecting Homer, and which proves that poems of even greater extent than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* can live in the memory and mouths of a nation. The Dschangariade of the Calmucks is said to surpass the poems of Homer in length, as much as it stands beneath them in merit<sup>r</sup>; and yet it exists only in the memory of a people which is not unacquainted with writing. The songs of a nation are probably the last things which are committed to writing, for the very reason that they are remembered.

But whatever opinions may be entertained on the origin of these poems, and whether we ascribe them to one or several authors, it will hardly be doubted that they all belong to one age, which we will call in a wider sense the age of Homer. The important fact is that we possess them. Whatever hypothesis we may adopt on their origin and formation, their influence on the Grecian nation and on posterity remains the same. And these are the points which claim our attention.

It was Homer who formed the character of the Greek nation. No poet has ever, as a poet, exercised a similar influence over his countrymen. Prophets, lawgivers, and sages have formed the character of other nations; it was reserved to a poet to form that of the Greeks. This is a feature in their character, which was not wholly erased even in the period of their degeneracy. When lawgivers and sages appeared in Greece, the work of the poet had already been accom-

<sup>r</sup> See on this subject BERGMANN, *Nomadische Streifereyen unter den Kalmycken*, vol. ii. p. 213, sqq. This Calmuck Homer flourished in the last century. He is said to have made three hundred and sixty cantos; but this number may be exaggerated. Of the singers, called Dschangartschi, it is not easy to find one who knows more than twenty by heart. In the fourth part of his work, Bergmann has given a translation of one of them, which is about equal in length to a rhapsody of Homer. It thus appears to be no uncommon thing for the Calmuck singers to retain in memory a poem nearly as long as the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*.

plished ; and they paid homage to his superior genius. He held up before his nation the mirror, in which they were to behold the world of gods and heroes no less than of feeble mortals, and to behold them reflected with purity and truth. His poems are founded on the first feelings of human nature ; on the love of children, wife, and country ; on that passion which outweighs all others, the love of glory. His songs were poured forth from a breast which sympathized with all the feelings of man ; and therefore they enter, and will continue to enter, every breast which cherishes the same sympathies. If it is granted to his immortal spirit, from another heaven than any of which he dreamed on earth, to look down on mankind, to see the nations from the fields of Asia to the forests of Hercynia, performing pilgrimages to the fountain which his magic wand caused to flow ; if it is permitted to him to view the vast assemblage of grand, of elevated, of glorious productions, which have been called into being by means of his songs ; wherever his immortal spirit may now abide, this alone would be sufficient to fill up the measure of his beatitude.

Wherever writing is known and used for the purpose of preserving poems, and thus a poetical literature is formed, the muse loses her youthful freshness. Works of the greatest merit may still be produced ; but poetry exerts its full influence only so long as it is considered inseparable from song and recitation. So far, therefore, were the Homeric poems from producing less effect because they were not circulated in writing, that, in fact, this was the very cause of their influence. They were written in the memory and the soul of the nation. If we were better acquainted with the forms of social life which were prevalent in the cities of Ionia, and with which poetry necessarily stood in the closest union, we should be able to judge more certainly of its effects. The nature of things seems to show, that there, as in the mother country, they must

have been sung at festivals and assemblies, whether public or private. This custom was so deeply fixed in the nation, that it continued long after these poems were committed to writing, and were thus accessible to a reader, and, in fact, it was recitation which continued to give them their full effect. We need but call to mind the remark which Ion the rhapsodist makes to Socrates<sup>s</sup>; “I see the hearers now weep and now rise in passion, and appear as if deprived of sensation.” If the rhapsodists, in an age when all that was divine in their art had passed away, and when they sung only for money, could produce such effects, how great must have been their influence in the period of their greatest glory.

Since the time of Homer, and chiefly through him, great changes in the circumstances of the class of bards necessarily took place; and the traces of such changes are still distinct. Originally they sang only their own compositions; but now it became the custom to sing those of others, which they had committed to memory. In that part of Asia which was inhabited by Greeks, and especially at Chios, where Homer is said to have lived<sup>t</sup>, a separate school of bards was formed which was known by the name of the Homeridae. Whether these consisted originally of the kinsmen of the poet, is a question of no interest; it became the name of those rhapsodists who sang the poems of Homer, or those attributed to him. They are therefore distinguished from the earlier rhapsodists by this, that they sang not their own works, but those of

<sup>s</sup> PLATO, vol. iv. p. 190.

<sup>t</sup> In the well-known passage in the hymn to Apollo, cited by THUCYDIDES, iii. 104. “A blind man who dwells on the rocky Chios, and whose songs will henceforth be the first among men.” Even if this hymn be not Homeric, (as Thucydides certainly supposed) it must have been composed in an age which approached that of Homer. That Homer was an inhabitant of Chios, is an account for the truth of which we have no other guarantee than tradition. But that tradition is a very ancient one, and the account contains nothing which is in itself improbable, or which should induce us to doubt its accuracy.

others ; and this appears to have been the first change which was effected, though without design, by Homer. But we may find in the gradual progress of the free towns, and the modes of living in them, a chief cause of a change in the rhapsodists, which could not be very advantageous for them. In these cities there may have been houses of the opulent and public porticoes<sup>u</sup>, in which they could recite ; but they found no longer the dwellings of heroes and kings. Little confidence as we may place in the life of Homer ascribed to Herodotus, and several other writings, it is still remarkable that they all unite in describing the fortunes of the poet during his lifetime as by no means splendid. But his songs continued to live, and, probably in the very first century after the poet, were carried by Lycurgus into the Peloponnesus ; and from the same school, other epic poets also rose, whose works have been swallowed by the stream of time<sup>v</sup>. A happy accident has preserved for us the general contents of a few of them<sup>y</sup>; but though these accounts are meagre, we may still infer from them, that, even among the ancients,

<sup>u</sup> The λέσχαι. We are almost involuntarily reminded of similar phenomena, which marked the decline of the poetry of chivalry, in the age of the German Meistersingers. May it be conjectured that the same circumstances of society, arising from city governments, produced the same effects on the school or brotherhood of the rhapsodists, who began at the same time to draw a more marked distinction between themselves and other classes ?

<sup>v</sup> The cyclic poets, as they are called, who treated subjects of mythological tradition, or the cyclos of traditions respecting the Trojan expedition. See on this subject HEYNE's *first Excursus to the second Aeneid*.

<sup>y</sup> In the extracts from Proclus, reprinted in GAISFORD's *Hephæstion*. These are : 1. the Cyprian poem, probably by Stasinus of Cyprus. It contained, in eleven books, the earlier events of the Trojan war, before the action of the Iliad. 2. The *Aethiopid* of Arctinus the Milesian ; containing, in five books, the expedition and death of Memnon. 3. The small *Iliad* of Lesches of Mytilene ; embracing, in four books, the contest of Ajax and Ulysses, till the fabrication of the Trojan horse. 4. The destruction of Troy (*Ιλίου πτώσις*) by Arctinus, in two books. 5. The Returns of the heroes (*νόστοι*) by Augias, in five books. 6. The *Tele-goniad*, or adventures of Ulysses after his return, by Eugammon in two books. The subjects of these poems, as here given, show, that no one of them can be compared, in point of plan, with the epic poems of Homer. But these also must for a long time have been preserved by tradition alone ; for their authors, though somewhat later than Homer, still lived in times when letters were little used, or entirely unknown.

they were chiefly of interest to the professed student of literature, and that they never gained any claim to be called national poems. But the works of these, and so many others, of whom we know only the names, show the general prevalence of epic poetry among the early Greeks. After the epic language had once been perfected by Homer, it remained peculiar to this kind of poetry; and when we read the works of much later poets, of Quintus, or of Nonnus, we might believe ourselves employed on authors many centuries older than they, had we not other evidence than their language to fix the period in which they lived. The subsequent use of the Homeric dialect in this class of poetry, had an important influence on Grecian literature. Amidst all the changes and improvements in language, it prevented the ancient from becoming antiquated, and secured it a place among the later modes of expression. This was a gain for the Greek language and for the nation. With the dialect of Homer, his spirit continued in some measure to live among the epic poets. Language cannot of itself make a poet; but yet how much depends on it? If in those later poets we occasionally hear echoes of Homer, is it not sometimes his spirit which addresses us?

But his influence on the mind of his countrymen was much more important than on their language. He had delineated the heroic age in colours which can never fade. He had made it present to posterity; and thus the artist and the tragic poet found a sphere opened for the employment of their powers of imitation. And the scenes from which they drew their subjects could not have remained foreign to their countrymen. We only touch on this subject, in order to say something on the point which lies particularly within the sphere of our inquiries; the influence which Homer and the epic poets exercised on the political character of their countrymen.

When we compare the scanty knowledge which we

possess, respecting the circulation and preservation of the poems of Homer, it is remarkable that in Greece itself the lawgivers and rulers were the most active in making them known and in saving them from perishing. Lycurgus, we are told was the first who introduced them into the Peloponnesus by means of the rhapsodists; Solon esteemed the subject so important, that in his laws he formed distinct regulations, from which it seems probable that the several rhapsodies were recited, not as before, without method, but in their natural order by several rhapsodists, who relieved each other at intervals. All this prepared for the undertaking of Pisistratus; who according to the accounts of the ancients, not only arranged the poems of Homer, but gained a claim to the eternal gratitude of posterity by committing them to writing<sup>z</sup>.

This care in those illustrious men did not result from a mere admiration of poetry. That it was connected with their political views, if it needs such confirmation, appears from the circumstance that Solon introduced it into his laws. Were we to<sup>w</sup> form a judgment on this subject, from the narrow views of our own times, it would seem strange, that they who founded or confirmed the government of the many, and indeed established a democracy, "should have laboured to extend the productions of a bard who was opposed to their principles, and declares his political creed without disguise<sup>x</sup>; "no good comes of the government of the many: let one be ruler, and one be king;" and in whose works, as we have already remarked, republican opinions find no support. But their views were not so limited. Their object was not to confirm, by the authority of the poet, their own institutions and laws. They desired to animate their nation with a love for excellence and sublimity. Poetry and song, indissolubly

<sup>x</sup> The passages in proof of this are collected and duly weighed in Wölz's *Prolegomena*, p. 139 sqq.

<sup>w</sup> *ll.* ii. 204.

united, seemed to them the fittest means of gaining that end. These had the greatest influence on the education of the people. And if this was a point considered by the Grecian lawgivers, (and it always was, though in different degrees,) of what importance in their eyes must that poet have been, whose poems, above all others, were recited by the class of rhapsodists that lent a glory to the national festivals and assemblies? Solon, himself one of the first of moral poets, could not but perceive how much experience and knowledge of the world are contained in those books, with which youth first begins, and to which age returns. No fear was entertained lest the narrations respecting the gods should be injurious to morals; although that fear afterwards induced Plato to banish them from his republic ; the philosopher, who, but for Homer, never could have become what he was. For, as we have already remarked, the gods were not held up as models for imitation. But whilst the people was enriching itself with that infinite treasure of practical wisdom, it continued at the same time to live in a world of heroes, and to preserve a taste for objects of beauty. It is impossible to estimate the consequences which resulted from this, the gain of the nation, as a nation, by the encouragement of its warlike spirit, by the preservation of its love of liberty and independence. In one respect those lawgivers were unquestionably in the right; a nation whose civilization rested on the Iliad and Odyssey could not easily become a nation of slaves. \*

## CHAPTER VII.

### MEANS BY WHICH THE NATIONAL CHARACTER WAS PRESERVED.

THE Greeks, though divided at home and extended widely in foreign countries, always considered themselves as forming one nation. The Grecian character was nowhere obliterated; the citizen of Massilia and Byzantium retained it no less than the Spartan and Athenian. The name *barbarian*, though it was applied to all who were not Greeks, conveyed a secondary idea, which was closely interwoven with the Grecian character: viz. that they esteemed themselves more cultivated than the rest of the world. It was not that gross kind of national pride, which despises all foreigners because they are foreigners; even where it was in itself unjust, its origin was a just one.

But this superior cultivation did not remain a bond of national union, as the different races of the Greeks possessed it in such different degrees. External marks were therefore needed. These were afforded by two things; viz. by language, and certain institutions sanctified by religion.

Various as were the dialects of the Greeks<sup>a</sup>—and these differences existed not only between the several tribes, but even between neighbouring cities—they yet acknowledged in their language that they formed but one nation, were but branches of the same family. Those who were not Greeks were described, even by

<sup>a</sup> See what HERODOTUS says of the dialects of the Greek cities in Asia, i. 142.

Homer<sup>b</sup>, as “men of other tongues;” and yet Homer had no general name for the Greek nation. But though a common language may be a natural and an indissoluble bond, something more is required to make it serve as a means of national union. The language must be not merely the instrument of communicating thoughts, for it is that to every savage; something must exist in it which may be regarded as the common property of the nation, because it is precious and dear to them: the works of poets, and, next to them, of prose writers, which are admired, listened to, and read by all. It is such productions which make a language really valuable to a nation. The national spirit and manner of thinking and feeling are expressed in them; the nation beholds in them its own portrait; and sees the continuance of its spirit among future generations secured. They form not only its common property, in which each tribe, according to the strict meaning of the word, has its undisputed share; they form its most sublime, its noblest, its least perishable property<sup>c</sup>. In what a light, therefore, do Homer and those who trod in his footsteps appear, when they are considered from this point of view? Their poems, listened to and admired by all who used the Greek language, reminded the inhabitants of Greece, of Ionia, and of Sicily, in the liveliest manner, that they were brothers. When we consider the long series of ages, during which the poems of Homer and the Homeridae were the only common property of the Greeks, it may even be made a question, whether without them they would have remained a nation<sup>d</sup>. National poetry was, therefore, the bond which held them together; but this bond was strengthened by another—by that of religion.

Unlike the religions of the east, the religion of the

<sup>b</sup> Βαρβαρόφωνοι, *Il.* ii. 867.

<sup>c</sup> See the author's dissertation on the Means of preserving the nationality of conquered nations: *Historische Werke*, vol. ii. p. 1.

<sup>d</sup> And would the Greeks still be a nation without their poetry and literature?

Greeks was contained in no sacred books, was connected with no peculiar doctrines; it could not therefore serve to unite a nation by means of a common religious creed; but it was fitted for gaining that end in so far as the external rites of religion afforded opportunities. But as there was no caste of priests, nor even a united order of priesthood, it naturally followed, that though particular sanctuaries could, in a certain degree, become national temples, this must depend, for the most part, on accidental circumstances; and where everything was voluntary, nothing could be settled by established forms such as prevailed in other countries. The temples of Olympia, Delos, and Delphi may justly be denominated national temples, though not in the same sense in which we call those of the Jews and the Egyptians national; but their effects were, perhaps, more considerable and more secure, because everything connected with them was voluntary. These temples also cherished and matured the fruits of civilization, though not in the same manner as those of Egypt and Ethiopia<sup>e</sup>; nor had their national festivals<sup>f</sup>, their oracles, and their Amphictyonic assemblies, the same effects as in other countries. But while we enumerate them individually, let it not be forgotten that all these fruits ripened on one and the same branch; that they, therefore, closely united, could ripen only together: that by this very means they gained a higher value in the eyes of the nation; and that this value must be estimated by their influence, rather than by what they were in themselves.

We shall hardly be mistaken if we consider those sanctuaries the most ancient which were celebrated for their oracles. Those of Dodona and Delphi were declared to be so by the voice of the nation; and both of them, especially that of Delphi, were so far superior to

<sup>e</sup> HEEREN'S *Historical Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Principal Nations of Antiquity. African Nations*, vol. i. p. 471. Oxford, 1832.

<sup>f</sup> The Greek word for them is πανηγύρεις.

the rest, that they are in some measure to be esteemed as the only national oracles<sup>g</sup>. We leave to others all farther investigation of these institutions ; the question which claims our attention is, how far they contributed to preserve the spirit and union of the nation. They did not effect this by being regarded as intended only for the Greeks. Foreigners also were permitted to consult the oracles ; and to pay for the answers which they received by consecrated presents. But this took place only in particular cases ; and was done probably by none but rulers, and kings, from the time when Alyattes first made application to Delphi<sup>h</sup>. In other cases the difference of language was alone sufficient to keep foreigners away, as the Pythian priestess always spoke in Greek. These institutions belonged, if not exclusively, yet principally, to the Greeks; of whom both individuals and cities could always have access to them. They formed the connecting link between the government and the popular religion. Their great political influence, especially in the states of the Doric race, is too well known to make it necessary for us to adduce proofs of it. That influence, doubtless, became less after the Persian war. Whether this diminution of influence was injurious or advantageous cannot easily be decided. When the reciprocal hatred of the Athenians and Spartans excited them to the fury of civil war, how much suffering would have been spared to Greece, if the voice of the gods had been able to avert the storm. But the affairs of the Delphian temple were still considered as the concern of the Grecian

<sup>g</sup> The Grecian oracles at last became, as is well known, exceedingly numerous. With the exception of that of Dodona, which was of Egyptian-Pelasgic origin, the oracles of the Greeks were almost exclusively connected with the worship of Apollo. We know of more than fifty of his oracles ; (see BULINGER *de oraculis et oraculis*, in *Thes. Ant. Gr.* vol. vii.) of the few others, the more celebrated owed their origin to the same god, as those of Mopsus and Trophonius, to whom he had imparted the gift of prophesying. How much of the Greek culture depended on the religion of Apollo ? On this subject a clearer light has been thrown by the researches of MÜLLER, *Dorians* vol. i. Book 2, published since the first appearance of this work.

<sup>h</sup> HEROD. i. 9.

nation ; and even after infidelity had usurped the place of the ancient superstition, the violation of that sanctuary gave the politicians a pretence sufficient to kindle a civil war, which was destined to cost Greece its liberties.

Among the numerous festivals which the several Greek cities were accustomed to celebrate, there were some, which from causes that are no longer well known, or were perhaps quite accidental, soon became really national. At these foreigners could be spectators ; but the Greeks alone were permitted to contend for the prizes. This right belonged to the inhabitant of the farthest colony, as well as of the mother country, and was esteemed inalienable and invaluable. Even princes were proud of the privilege, for which the Persian king himself would have sued in vain, of sending their chariots to the races of Olympia. Every one has learned, from the odes of Pindar, that, besides the Olympic contests, the Pythian games at Delphi, the Nemean at Argos, and the Isthmian at Corinth were of this number. As to the origin of these games, Homer does not make mention of them, which he would hardly have neglected to do if they had existed or been famous in his day. Yet the foundation of them was laid in so remote a period of antiquity, that it is attributed to gods and heroes. Uncertain as are these traditions, it is remarkable that a different origin is attributed to each one of them. Those of Olympia were instituted by Hercules on his victorious return, and were designed as contests in bodily strength ; those of Delphi were at first only musical exercises ; though other contests were afterwards added. Those of Nemea were originally funeral games ; respecting the occasion of instituting those on the Isthmus, there are different accounts<sup>i</sup>.

<sup>i</sup> All the passages on the origin and the arrangements of the games may be found collected in SCHMIDTII *Prolegomina ad Pindarum* ; POTTER's *Antiquities* ; CORINTI's *Dissertationes Agonisticae*, etc.

But, whatever may have been the origin of the games, they became national ones. This did not certainly take place at once; and we should err if we applied the accounts given us of the Olympic games in the flourishing periods of Greece to earlier ages. On the contrary, from the accurate registers which were kept by the judges, we learn most distinctly that these games gained their importance and character only by degrees<sup>k</sup>. They have not forgotten to mention when the different kinds of contests (for at first there were no races) were permitted and adopted. But still these games gained importance, though it was gradually; and the time came when they were worthy to be celebrated by Pindar.

In this manner therefore these festivals, and the games connected with them, received a national character. They were peculiar to the Greeks; and on that account also were of great utility. "They are justly praised," Isocrates<sup>l</sup> very happily observes, "who instituted these famous assemblies, and thus made it customary for us to come together as allies, having set aside our hostilities; to increase our friendship by recalling our relationship in our common vows and sacrifices; to renew our ancient family friendships, and to form new ones. They have provided, that neither the unpolished nor the well educated should leave the games without profit; but that in this assembly of the Greeks in one place, some may display their wealth, and others observe the contests, and none be present without a purpose, but each have something of which to boast; the one part, while they see those engaged in the contest making exertions on their account; the other, when they consider that all this concourse of people has assembled to be spectators of their contests."

The accounts which we read of the splendour of these

<sup>k</sup> See PAUSANIAS, *Eliac.* v. 9.

<sup>l</sup> ISOCRATES, *Panegyr.* p. 49. Steph.

games, especially of the Olympic, where the Greek nation appeared in all its glory, give a high idea of them. And yet it was public opinion, far more than the reality, which gave its value to the crown of victory. The glory of being conqueror in these games was the highest with which the Grecian was acquainted; it conferred honour, not only on him who won the palm, but on his family and on his native city. He was not honoured in Olympia alone; his victory was the victory of his native place; here he was solemnly received; new festivals were instituted on his account; and he had afterwards a right of living at the public charge in the Prytaneum. A victory at Olympia, says Cicero with truth<sup>m</sup>, rendered the victor illustrious no less than his consulship the Roman consul. The tournaments of the middle age were something similar; or rather might have become something similar if the circumstances of society had permitted it. But as a distinct line of division was drawn between the different ranks, they became interesting to but one class. Birth decided who could take a part in them, and who were excluded. There was nothing of this among the Greeks. The lowest of the people could join at Olympia in the contest for the branch of the sacred olive tree, as well as Alcibiades, or even the ruler of Syracuse with all the splendour of his chariots.

Their influence on the political affairs of the Grecian states was perhaps not so great as Isocrates represents it. A solemnity of a few days could hardly be sufficient to cool the passions and still the mutual enmities of the several states. History mentions no peace which was ever negotiated, and still less which was ever concluded, at Olympia. But so much the greater was the influence exercised over the mental culture of the nation; and if the culture of a nation decides its character, our plan requires of us to pause and consider it.

<sup>m</sup> CICERO. *Quæst. Tusc.* ii. 17.

In all their institutions, when they are considered in the light in which the Greeks regarded them, we shall commonly find proofs of the correct feelings of that people. And these are to be observed in the games, where everything which was in itself beautiful and glorious—bodily strength and skill in boxing, wrestling, and running; the splendour of opulence, as displayed in the equipages for the chariot races; excellence in poetry, and in other intellectual productions—was rewarded with its prize. But the degree of importance assigned to the productions of mind was not everywhere the same. Musical contests<sup>n</sup>, in which the Greeks united poetry, song, and music, were indeed introduced at the larger games, as well as in those hardly less splendid ones which were instituted in the several cities; but not in equal degrees. At Olympia, though they were not entirely excluded, they were yet less essential<sup>o</sup>; while in the Pythian games they formed from their earliest origin the primary object. They held the same rank in several festivals of the individual cities, at the Panathenæa at Athens, at Delos<sup>p</sup>, Epidaurus, Ephesus, and other places. But even where no actual contest took place, every one who felt possessed of sufficient talents was permitted to come for-

<sup>n</sup> The Greeks made a distinction between ἀγῶνες γυμνικοί and μουσικοί. The former relate to the exercises of the body; the latter to the works of genius; that is, to poetry and literature, and music. At these festivals it never entered the mind of the Greeks to institute prizes for competitors in the arts of design; at least not in painting or sculpture (PLINY, however, mentions a competition of painters, xxxv. 35.) The cause of this may in part be, that those arts were not so soon brought to perfection as the former ones; but I hardly doubt, that the cause was rather that the Greeks conceived it proper to institute competition only in those arts of which the results were temporary, and not in those of which the productions are exhibited in public and are lasting; for in them, as in sculpture for example, there is a constant exhibition, and therefore a constant emulation.

<sup>o</sup> See the instructive Essay on the musical contests of the ancients, in the *Neue Bibliothek der Schönen Wissenschaften*, vol. vii.

<sup>p</sup> The musical contests in Delos, with which gymnastic exercises soon came to be connected, were the most ancient national games of the Ionians; as THUCYDIDES, iii. 104, has proved from the Homeric hymn to Apollo. They were originally connected with the service of that god, and were communicated with it by the Ionians to the Dorians. Hence they were not regarded at Olympia, Nemea, and on the Isthmus, as forming an essential part of the solemnity.

ward with the productions of his art. The rhapsodist and the performer on the flute; the lyric poet, the historian, and the orator, had each his place. The odes of Pindar were chanted in honour of the victors, not in emulation of others; and Herodotus had no rival when he read his history at Olympia. These assemblies were large enough to afford room for the reception of everything which was glorious and beautiful; and it was especially at Olympia and Delphi that the observer of the character of the Greeks could justly break forth in exclamations of admiring astonishment.

The Amphictyonic assemblies, as they were called by the Greeks, appear to have exercised a still greater influence on political union<sup>q</sup>. By this name are signified certain assemblies held in some common temple by several tribes which occupied the territory round it, or by neighbouring cities, in order to consult on the affairs connected with the sanctuary, and on others of a more general nature. It was therefore characteristic of these assemblies, first, that they were held at a temple or sanctuary; secondly, that several tribes or cities participated in them; thirdly, that popular assemblies, festivals, and also games were connected with them, and fourthly, that besides these popular assemblies and festivals, deputies under various names (Theori, Pylagoræ, etc.) were sent by the confederate states, to deliberate on subjects of common interest. We shall be better able to see these institutions in their true light by first taking a view of the origin of temples in Greece.

As soon as the different cities had become the centres of political society in Greece, and had, both in the mother country and the colonies, been enriched by commerce and industry, temples were built by single towns. Besides this, as we shall show more fully in

<sup>q</sup> The Greek word is sometimes spelt ἀμφικτίονες, “those who dwell round about,” sometimes ἀμφικτύονες, from the hero Amphictyon, called by tradition the founder of them.

another place, the public luxury was connected almost exclusively with these temples, and they served as the measure of the splendour and wealth of the respective cities. The building of temples therefore became, especially after the Persian wars, and even a century before them, a matter in which the honour of the cities was concerned, and their public spirit was to be exhibited. In this manner that multitude of temples arose, which still present, in their numerous ruins, masterpieces of architecture. But it was not and could not have been so in the earliest times. The building of a temple was then commonly a joint undertaking; partly because these temples, however much they may have been inferior to those of later times<sup>r</sup>, were still too costly to be borne by the separate communities; and partly and chiefly because such common sanctuaries were needed for celebrating the common festivals of each race.

Such a sanctuary formed always in some measure a point of union. It was an object of common care; it became necessary to watch over the temple itself, its estates, and its possessions; and as this could not be done by the several communities at large, what could be more natural than to depute envoys for the purpose? But in a nation where everything was freely developed, and so little was fixed by established forms, it could not but happen that other affairs of general interest would occasionally be discussed, either at the popular festivals, or in the assemblies of the delegates; and the latter is the more probable, as the confederates considered themselves, for the most part, as members of the same race. They became, therefore, the points of political union; the idea of a formal alliance was not yet connected with them, but might be expected from their maturity.

We find traces of these Amphictyonic assemblies in

<sup>r</sup> See what PAUSANIAS (Book 8. 810.) says of the temples which were successively built at Delphi.

Greece itself, and in the colonies<sup>s</sup>. Their origin, especially in the mother country, was very ancient; and we may in most cases affirm it to have belonged to the period when the republican forms of government had not yet been introduced, and the governments of the separate tribes were in vigour. For we find that those who shared in them were much more frequently influenced to assemble by races than by cities. And this affords an obvious reason why they lost their influence as the people advanced in civilization, unless where peculiar causes operated to preserve them. In the flourishing period of Greece, most of them had become mere antiquated usages, which were only occasionally mentioned; or, if they continued in the popular festivals which were connected with them, (and popular festivals are always longest preserved,) they were but bodies without soul. This result necessarily came to pass, since, on the downfall of the government of the tribes, the whole political life of the nation was connected with the cities, the spirit of the tribes had become annihilated by the spirit of the cities, and each of the cities had erected its own temples.

Yet of these Amphictyonic councils one rose to a higher importance, and always preserved a certain degree of dignity; so that it was called, by way of eminence, the Amphictyonic council. This was

<sup>s</sup> A catalogue of them, which might perhaps be enlarged, has been given by St. CROIX, *Des anciens Gouvernements fidératifs*, p. 115 sq. We follow him, as it will afford, at the same time, proofs of what has been said above. There was an Amphictyonia in Boeotia, at Onchestus, in a temple of Neptune; in Attica, in a temple of which the name is not mentioned; at Corinth, on the Isthmus, in the temple of Neptune; in the island Calauria, near Argolis, also in a temple of Neptune; another in Argolis, in the celebrated temple of Juno (*Heraion*); in Elis, in a temple of Neptune: also on the Grecian islands; in Eubœa, in the temple of Diana Amaurusia; in Delos, in the temple of Apollo, the Panegyris, of which we have already made mention, and which served for all the neighbouring islands; in Asia, the Panionium at Mycale, afterwards at Ephesus, for the Ionians; the temple of Apollo Triopius, for the Dorians; for the Eolians, the temple of Apollo Glyneus. Even the neighbouring Asiatic tribes, the Carians and the Lycians, had similar institutions, either peculiar or adopted of the Greeks. The proofs of these statements may be found in the above-mentioned author.

the one held at Delphi and Thermopylæ<sup>t</sup>. If we bear in mind the facts which have just been illustrated, we shall hardly be led to expect that this assembly could ever have united the whole Greek nation, as a common bond; still less that this bond should have been more closely drawn with the progress of time, and finally have united all the Grecian states in one political body. But this Amphictyonic assembly contributed much to the preserving of national feeling and national union, and, as such, deserves to be considered by us with attention.

Strabo admits<sup>u</sup> that even in his time it was impossible to ascertain the origin of the Amphictyonic assembly: it was nevertheless certain, that it belonged to remote antiquity. We must here remark, that Homer does not make any mention of it; and yet he speaks of the wealthy Delphi<sup>x</sup>; and although his silence affords no proof that it did not exist, we may at least infer that the council was not then so important as it afterwards became. The causes which made this Amphictyonia so much superior to all the rest are not expressly given; but should we err if we were to look for them in the ever-increasing dignity and influence of the Delphic oracle? When we call to mind the great importance attached to the liberty of consulting this oracle, scarcely a doubt on the subject can remain. The states which were members of this Amphictyonia had indeed no exclusive right to that privilege; but they had the care of the temple, and therefore of the oracle, in their hands<sup>y</sup>. No ancient writer has preserved so accurate an account of the regulations of that insti-

<sup>t</sup> From STRABO, ix. p. 643. it does not appear that the assembly was held alternately at Delphi and Thermopyle; but the deputies first met at Thermopyle to sacrifice to Ceres; and then proceeded to Delphi where business was transacted.

<sup>u</sup> STRABO, l. c. On this subject generally see TITTMANN, *Über den Bund der Amphiktyonen*; Berlin, 1812, [of which work the English reader will find an account in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, vol. vi. p. 141. E.]

<sup>x</sup> Il. ix. 404, 405. Homer calls it Pythe.

<sup>y</sup> Individual states obtained the right of being the first to consult the oracle, *προμαντεία*, which right was valued very highly.

tution, as to enable us to answer all important questions respecting them; and those who speak of them do not agree with each other. But, from a comparison of their statements, we may infer, that though this Amphictyonia did not by any means embrace the whole of the Greeks, yet the most considerable states of the mother country and of Asia Minor took part in it. According to Æschines<sup>2</sup>, there were twelve members (although he enumerates but eleven); viz. Thessalians, Boeotians, (and not the Thebans only, as he expressly remarks,) Dorians, Ionians, Perrhaebians, Magnesians, Phthiotans, Maleans<sup>a</sup>, Phocians, Ætæans, and Locrians; the twelfth state was probably the Dolopians<sup>b</sup>. Every city belonging to these nations had the right of sending deputies; the smallest had the same right with the largest; and the votes of all were equal; of the Ionians, says Æschines, the deputies from Eretria in Eubœa, and from Priene in Asia Minor<sup>c</sup>, were equal to those from Athens; of the Dorians, those of Dorium in Laconia, and of Cytinium at the foot of Parnassus, had as much weight as those of Lacedæmon. But the votes were counted not by cities, but by tribes; each tribe had two votes, and the majority decided<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> ÆSCHINES *de fals. leg.* p. 285, ed. Reisk. This is the most important passage. ST. CROIX, p. 27, has compared the discrepant accounts of PAUSANIAS, x. p. 815, and HERODOTUS, v. Αμφικτυορες. The authority of Æschines respecting his own times seems of more weight than all the others; and therefore I follow him alone. No one had better means of information than he. But many changes were subsequently made by the Macedonians and the Romans.

<sup>b</sup> The last four were all in Thessaly. The reason of their being thus distinguished from the rest of the Thessalians is probably to be found in the privilege which they had preserved of a separate vote. HERODOTUS, vii. 132, divides them in the same manner.

<sup>c</sup> See TITTMANN, p. 39.

<sup>d</sup> It is therefore certain that the colonies in Asia Minor had a share in this assembly. We might suggest the question, whether all the Asiatic colonies, and whether colonies in other regions, did the same.

<sup>e</sup> For all further knowledge which we have of the regulations of the Amphictyonic council we are indebted to STRABO, ix. p. 289. According to him, each city sent a deputy (Pylagore). These assembled twice a year, at the equinoxes. We are ignorant of the length of the sessions of the assembly, whether any definite time was fixed for them, or not; and of many other things respecting them.

The next point of inquiry is, the sphere of action in which this assembly was accustomed to exert its influence. Its first duty was to take charge of the temple; its property; its offerings; its sanctity. From this it naturally follows, that the assembly possessed judicial powers. Persons who had committed sacrilege against the temple were summoned before its tribunal, where judgment was passed and fines and punishment decreed<sup>d</sup>. But to these political objects were added at a very early period; such as the preservation of peace among the confederates, and the settling of any contentions which had arisen. We have, it is true, no proof that those who belonged to the assembly considered themselves as closely allied with each other; but it is as little doubtful, that under the protection of this sanctuary certain ideas arose and were diffused, which might be considered as forming, in some measure, the foundation of a system of national law, although it was never brought to maturity. Of this we have indisputable proof in the ancient oaths which were taken by all the members of the assembly, and which have been preserved by Æschines<sup>e</sup>. “I read,” says the orator, “in the assembly the oaths to which the heaviest imprecations were attached; and by which our ancestors<sup>f</sup> were obliged to promise never to destroy any one of the Amphictyonic cities<sup>g</sup>, nor to cut off their streams<sup>h</sup>, whether in war or in peace; should any city dare notwithstanding to do so, they swore to take up arms against it and lay it waste; and if any one should sin against the god, or form any scheme against the sanctuary, to oppose him with hand and foot, by word and deed.” This form of oath, it cannot be doubted,

<sup>d</sup> As, for instance, against the Phocians, at the beginning of its last sacred war, and afterwards against the Locrians. Demosthenes has preserved for us two of these decrees, (*δόγματα*, &c.) p. 278. Reisk. From them we learn the forms in which they were written.

<sup>e</sup> ÆSCHINES ubi sup. p. 284.

<sup>f</sup> Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι.

<sup>g</sup> Ἀναστατων παιῆται, to render desolate by removing its inhabitants.

<sup>h</sup> By means of which they would have become uninhabitable.

was very ancient, and expressess with sufficient clearness the original objects of the confederation. But it shows likewise that the attainment of these ends depended much more on the circumstances and condition of the age, than on the members of the council themselves.

To him who measures the value of this assembly only by the influence which it had in preventing wars among the tribes that took part in it, its utility may seem very doubtful; as history has preserved no proofs of such influence. But even had this existed in the earliest ages, it must have ceased of itself when single states of Greece became so powerful as to assume a supremacy over the rest. Sparta and Athens no more referred the decision of their quarrels to Delphi, than Prussia and Austria to Ratisbon. But it would be wrong to impute the blame of this to the members of the council. They had no strong arm, except when the god extended his to protect them; or some other power took the field in their behalf. But it is a high degree of merit to preserve principles in the memory of mankind, even when it is impossible to prevent their violation. And when we observe that several ideas relating to the law of nations were indelibly imprinted on the character of the Greeks; if in the midst of all their civil wars, they never laid waste any Grecian city, even when it was subdued; may we not attribute this in some measure to the Amphictyonic assembly? They had it not in their power to preserve peace; but they contributed to prevent the Greeks from forgetting, even in war, that they still were Greeks.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE PERSIAN WAR AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

SINCE the Trojan war no opportunity had been presented to the Greek nation of acting as one people in any common undertaking. The institutions which we have just described, preserved in a certain degree the national spirit ; but they were not sufficient to produce any firm political union ; all tendency to which was counteracted by the internal circumstances and condition of Greece. Even the colonies were unfavourable to it ; not only from their distance, but still more from the independence which they enjoyed. In our days we may observe how soon colonies, which become independent, grow estranged from the mother countries, after having long stood in the closest connection with them.

In the age which preceded the Persian war<sup>a</sup>, the Grecian states, excepting the Asiatic cities, which languished under the Persian yoke, had in many respects made advances in civilization. Freedom had been triumphantly established in almost every part of the mother country<sup>b</sup>. The tyrants who had usurped power in the cities had been overthrown in part by the Spartans, in part by the citizens themselves ; and popular governments had been introduced in their stead. Above all, Athens had shaken off the Pisistratidæ, and come off victorious from the contest which

<sup>a</sup> Between 600 and 500 B. C.

<sup>b</sup> Thessaly was an exception, where the government of the Aleuadae still continued, although it was tottering ; for which reason they, like the Pisistratidæ, invited the Persians into Greece. HEROD. vii. 6.

she had been obliged to sustain for her liberty. She was in the consciousness of her youthful energies. "Athens" says Herodotus<sup>c</sup>, "which before was great, when freed from its usurpers, became still greater." At the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ, Sparta had, for the first time, undertaken to exert an influence beyond the Peloponnesus; Corinth had also, for eighty-four years<sup>d</sup>, been in possession of freedom; and a similar advantage had been gained by several of the less powerful cities, as by Sicyon<sup>e</sup> and Epidaurus. The islands, no less than the continent, were in a flourishing condition; their independence was not then menaced by the Persians or the Athenians. Samos never saw an age like that of Polycrates, who trembled at his own prosperity<sup>f</sup>; the small island of Naxos could muster eight thousand heavy-armed men<sup>g</sup>; the small island of Siphnos, enriched by its gold mines, thought it expedient to consult the Pythian oracle on the duration of its fortunes<sup>h</sup>. The cities of Magna Græcia, Tarentum, Croton, and Sybaris<sup>i</sup>, had attained the period of their splendour; in Sicily, Syracuse, though disturbed by internal dissensions, was yet so powerful, that Gelon, its ruler, claimed in the Persian war the chief command of all the Grecian forces; Massilia arose on the shores of Gaul; Cyrene was established on the coast of Libya.

But some grand object of common interest still was wanting; and as the Spartans were already jealous of Athens, it was the more to be feared, that the consciousness of increasing strength would only lead the different states to their mutual destruction in civil wars. The Persian war supplied the object which was needed. Although this did not produce that union of the whole Greek nation, which a great man had conceived with-

<sup>c</sup> HEROD. v. 66.

<sup>d</sup> From 584 B. C.

<sup>e</sup> From about 600 B. C. Epidaurus at the same time.

<sup>f</sup> HEROD. iii. 72.

<sup>g</sup> HEROD. v. 30.

<sup>h</sup> PAUSAN. *Phoc.* p. 628.

<sup>i</sup> HEROD. vi. 127. Sybaris, however, was destroyed, just before the Persian war, by the Crotoniates, in 510 B. C.

out believing in its possibility, yet the whole condition of Greece in succeeding ages, her foreign and domestic relations, were all influenced by it ; and we do not say too much, when we assert that by it the political character of Greece was formed.

There never indeed was any general union of the Greeks against the Persians ; but the idea of such a combination had been awakened ; and was, if not entirely, yet in a great measure carried into effect. What can be more arduous than in times of great difficulty, when every one fears for himself and is chiefly concerned for self-preservation, to keep up, among a multitude of small states, that public spirit and union in which all strength consists ? The Athenians were left almost alone to repel the first invasion of Darius the son of Hystaspes ; but the glory won at Marathon was not sufficient to create a general enthusiasm, when greater danger threatened them from the invasion of Xerxes. All the Thessalians, the Locrians, and Bœotians, except the cities of Thespiae and Plataeæ, sent earth and water to the Persian king upon the first call to submit ; although these tokens of subjection were attended by the curses of the rest of the Greeks, and a vow that a tithe of their lands should be consecrated to the Delphian Apollo<sup>k</sup>. Yet of the other Greeks who did not favour Persia, some offered to assist only on condition of commanding the allied forces<sup>l</sup> ; others, if their country should be the first to be protected<sup>m</sup> ; some sent a squadron, which was ordered to wait till it

<sup>k</sup> HEROD. vii. 132.

<sup>l</sup> Gelon of Syracuse, HEROD. vii. 158. On this condition, he promised to produce an army of 28,000 men, well equipped ; a fleet of 200 triremes, and as much corn as was desired. " Of a truth," answered the Laedamonian ambassador, " Agamemnon, the descendant of Pelops, would lament loudly, were he to hear that the chief command had been taken from the Spartans, by Gelon the Syracusan." And when Gelon declared, that he would be content with the command by sea ; the Athenian envoy instantly replied : " King of Syracuse, Greece has sent us to you, not because it needs a general, but because it needs an army."

<sup>m</sup> The Thessalians, who had however already surrendered, HEROD. vii. 72.

was certain which side would gain the victory<sup>n</sup>; while others pretended that they were restrained by the declarations of an oracle<sup>o</sup>. So true is the remark of Herodotus, that, however ill it might be taken by others, he was compelled to declare that Greece was indebted for its freedom to Athens<sup>p</sup>. Athens, with Themistocles for its leader, gave life and courage to the other states; induced them to lay aside their quarrels; yielded, where it was its duty to yield<sup>q</sup>; and always relied on its own strength, while it seemed to expect safety from all. Her hopes were not disappointed in the result; the battle of Salamis gave a new impulse to the spirit of the Greeks; and when in the following year<sup>r</sup> the battle of Plataæ decided the contest, the greater part of Greece was assembled in the field of battle<sup>s</sup>.

We will give no description of those glorious days, but only of their effects on the destinies of Greece. In the actions of men, greatness is seldom or never quite unmixed with meanness; and he who investigates the events of those times with care, will find many and various proofs of it. And yet in the whole compass of history, we can find no series of events which deserves to be compared with the grand spectacle then exhibited; and with all the exaggerations of the orators and poets, the feeling of pride with which the Greeks reflected on their achievements, was just and well-founded. A small country had withstood the attack of half a continent; it had not only saved the most valuable possessions which were at stake, its liberty, its independence; but it felt itself strong enough to continue the contest, and did not lay down its arms till it was able to prescribe the conditions of peace.

<sup>n</sup> The Corcyraeans, HEROD. vii. 168.

<sup>o</sup> The Cretans, HEROD. vii. 169.

<sup>p</sup> HEROD. vii. 139. A noble testimony in favour of Athens, and, at the same time, of the free spirit and impartiality of Herodotus. "I must here," says this lover of truth, "express to all Greece an opinion, which to most men is odious: but yet that which to me seems the truth I will not conceal."

<sup>q</sup> As at Artemisium, HEROD. viii. 3

<sup>r</sup> 479 B. C.

<sup>s</sup> HEROD. ix. 28.

The price of that peace was the emancipation of the Greek colonies in Asia from the Persian yoke. Twenty years before the invasion of Xerxes, when those cities had attempted to throw off the supremacy of Persia, the Athenians had boldly ventured to send a squadron with troops to reinforce them; and that expedition occasioned the burning of Sardes, the capital of the Persian dominions in Asia Minor. "These ships," says Herodotus<sup>t</sup>, "were the origin of the wars between the Greeks and the barbarians." This interference was deeply resented by the Persians; and their resentment would have been reasonable, if they had possessed the right of reducing free cities to a state of dependence. Herodotus has given a full account of the ill success of the revolt, and of the manner in which Miletus suffered for it. Even in the subsequent expeditions of the Persians against Europe, the ruling idea was the desire of taking revenge on Athens; and when Xerxes reduced that city to ashes, he doubtless considered it as a retaliation for the burning of Sardes<sup>u</sup>. But when the victory remained in the hands of the Greeks, they continued with spirit a war, which for them was no longer dangerous; and though the emancipation of their countrymen became from that time nothing more than a pretence<sup>x</sup>, it was still a proof of the reviving national spirit. When the war after fifty-one years was terminated by the first peace with Persia<sup>y</sup>, it was made on the conditions, that the Greek cities in Asia should be free; that the Persian troops should keep two days' march distant from them; and that their squadron should leave the Aegean sea<sup>z</sup>. In

<sup>t</sup> HEROD. v. 97.<sup>u</sup> HEROD. viii. 54.

<sup>x</sup> The Asiatic Greeks, however, during the expedition of Xerxes, in which they were compelled to take a part with their ships, had entreated the Spartans and Athenians to liberate them. HEROD. viii. 132.

<sup>y</sup> In 449 B. C. reckoning from the share of the Persians in the revolt of the Asiatic Greeks under Aristagoras, in 500 B. C.

PLUTARCH, in *Cimon*, p. 202, quotes the decree of the people, containing the conditions. That this treaty was ever formally concluded, has been shown by DAHLMANN, *Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der Geschichte*, vol. i. to be very problematical. At any rate the war came to a termination.

*a like manner, after a long contest, emancipated Holland dictated the conditions of peace to the ruler of both the Indies, and blockaded the mouths of his rivers, while she preserved the ocean open to herself.*

Thus the people of Greece, by means of this war, appeared to the world in the splendour of victory. They were now permitted to look around in tranquil security; for who would venture to attack them? The eastern world obeyed the humbled Persian; in the north, the kingdom of Macedonia had not begun its career of conquest; and Italy, still divided into small states, did not as yet contain a victorious republic. The period was therefore come when Greece could unfold all its youthful vigour; poetry and the fine arts could now flourish undisturbed; the philosophical mind contemplate its own operations in tranquillity; and the public spirit of the several cities could exert itself in reciprocal competition. A nation does not need peace and tranquillity to become great; but it needs the consciousness that it is possessed of strength, to gain peace and tranquillity.

The Persian wars gave a character, not only to the relations of Greece with foreign countries, but also to its internal state; nor is it easy to decide which change was attended with the most important results. During that contest, the idea of a supremacy, or *hyperechia*, as the Greeks termed it, intrusted to one state over the rest, or usurped by it, became prevalent throughout Greece.

Even before the Persian war, the idea had been faintly expressed; Sparta had always, as the most powerful of the Doric states, claimed a sort of supremacy in the Peloponnesus; and had in some measure deserved it, by banishing the tyrants from the cities of that peninsula<sup>a</sup>.

In the opposition made by so many Greek cities to the attack of Xerxes, the want of a common leader

<sup>a</sup> THUCYD. i. 18, 76.

was felt; but according to Grecian principles, this command could not so well be committed to one man as to one state. We have already observed that several laid claims to it; those of Syracuse were at once rejected; and Athens was at once prudent and generous enough to yield. The honour was therefore nominally conferred on Sparta; but it was really possessed by the state whose talents merited it; and Sparta had no Themistocles. But Athens soon gained it in name as well as in fact, when the haughtiness of Pausanias had exasperated the confederates, and Sparta was deprived by his fall of the only man who in those days could have reflected any lustre upon his country<sup>b</sup>.

In this manner Athens was placed at the head of a large Greek armament, leagued against Persia; and from this moment her supremacy began to have a real effect on the affairs of Greece. The circumstances under which this chief command was conferred on Athens, showed that nothing more was meant to be given than the conduct of the war which was still to be continued with united efforts against the Persians. No government of the allied states, no interference in their internal affairs, was intended. But much advantage was obviously to be derived from the management of a war against a powerful enemy, and especially by those who knew how to profit by it. As long as the war against the Persian king lasted, could it be less than

<sup>b</sup> Of this we have accurate accounts in THUCYDIDES, i. 95. The Spartans, Athenians, and many of the confederates, had undertaken a naval expedition against Cyprus and Byzantium, 470 B. C. Offended with Pausanias (who about this time was recalled by Sparta herself), the allies, especially the Ionians, entreated the Athenians, as being of a kindred tribe, to assume the supreme command. The Peloponnesians took no part in this act. The Athenians were very willing to comply with the request; and the confederates never received another Spartan general. From this account, the following points are to be inferred: 1. The Athenians obtained the same chief command, which had been before exercised by the Spartans. 2. The states which conferred that command on Athens, were islands and maritime towns, as the whole expedition was a naval one. 3. Although not all who shared in it were Ionians, yet the affinity of race had a great influence on the choice. 4. The command conferred on the Athenians did not embrace all the Grecian cities, nor even all which had been united against Persia; as the Peloponnesians all withdrew, and the other inland states took no part in it.

the control of all external affairs? For at such a juncture as this, what other affairs were there to occupy or interest the Greeks? Or if any others existed, were they not at least intimately connected with this war? And as to the grand questions respecting the duration of the war and the conditions of peace, did they not depend on those who stood at the head of the undertaking?

The first use which Athens made of this command, was the establishment of a common treasury, as well as a common fleet, for the carrying on of the war; while it was fixed which of the Allies should contribute money and ships, and in what proportion. The Athenians, says Thucydides<sup>c</sup>, now first established the office of treasurers of the Greeks<sup>d</sup>; who were to collect the tribute, as the sums which were raised were denominated, (and names are not matters of indifference in politics;) the amount of which was then fixed at four hundred and sixty talents<sup>e</sup>. Yet to avoid everything which might seem odious, the treasury was not immediately fixed at Athens, but at Delos, in the temple of Apollo; where the assemblies also were held. But the most important circumstance was, that the most just of the Greeks, Aristides, was appointed treasurer; and the office of assigning to each state its proportion of the general contribution was intrusted to him<sup>f</sup>. No one in those days made any complaint; and Aristides died as poor as he had lived.

Two remarks are here so naturally suggested, that they hardly need fresh confirmation; the first is, that Athens, by means of this regulation, laid the foundation of its greatness; the second is, that hardly any government, and much less a popular government, could long withstand the temptation to abuse this power. But a third remark must be made in connection with

<sup>c</sup> THUCYD. i. 96.

<sup>d</sup> Ελληνοταρπια.

<sup>e</sup> About 90,000*l.*

<sup>f</sup> PLUTARCH. Aristid. vol. ii. p. 535.

the preceding; Athens gained the rank which she holds in the history of the world by means of her supremacy over the other states. The importance which she gained was immediately of a political nature; but everything of a vast and noble character, for which Athens was distinguished, was inseparably connected with her political greatness. We will not disguise any one of the abuses of which the consequences were finally most fatal to Athens herself; but we cannot limit our view to the narrow range adopted by those, who make the abuses the criterion of their judgment.

The allies, by committing the conduct of the war to Athens, expressly acknowledged that city to be the first in Greece, and this was silently admitted by the other states; for Sparta which alone could rival her in power, voluntarily withdrew into the back ground<sup>s</sup>. Athens was conscious of deserving this rank; for to her Greece was indebted for its liberty. But she was desirous of preserving her high station, not by force alone, but by showing herself to be the first in everything which, according to the views of the Greeks, could render a city illustrious. Her temples were now to be the most splendid; her works of art the noblest, her festivals and theatres the most beautiful and the most costly. But for the supremacy of Athens, Pericles never could have found a sphere of action worthy of himself; no Phidias, no Polygnotus, no Sophocles could have flourished. The public spirit of the Athenians proceeded from the consciousness that they were the first of the Greeks; and nothing but that public spirit could have encouraged and rewarded the genius which was capable of producing such works as theirs. Perhaps their very greatness prepared the fall of Athens; but if they were doomed to suffer for it, the gratitude due to them from mankind is not therefore diminished.

<sup>s</sup> THUCYD. i. 95.

*The supremacy of Athens was, as is plain from the nature of the whole confederacy, immediately connected with her naval superiority; for the allied states were all either islands or maritime cities. Thus the expressions of *supreme command*<sup>h</sup>, and *dominion of the sea*<sup>i</sup>, that is, the dominion of the Ægean and Ionian seas, (for the ambition of the Athenians extended no farther,) came to signify the same thing. This dominion of the sea was therefore, in its origin, not only not blameable, but absolutely essential to the attainment of the object in view. The security of the Greeks against the attacks of the Persians depended on it; and so too did the continuance of the confederacy. We cannot indeed acquit Athens of the charge of having afterwards abused her naval superiority; but whoever considers the nature of such alliances and the difficulty of holding them together, will admit that in practice it would be almost impossible to avoid the appearance of abusing such a supremacy; since the same things which to one party seem an abuse, in the eyes of the other are only the necessary means to secure the end.*

When the sea had been made secure, and no farther attack was to be feared from the Persians, how could it be otherwise, than that the continuance of the war, and consequently the money levied for supporting it, should be to many of them unnecessarily oppressive? And how could it be avoided, that some should feel themselves injured, or be really injured, by the contributions exacted from them? The consequences of all this were, on the one side, a refusal to pay the contributions, and, on the other, severity in collecting them<sup>k</sup>; and as they were still refused, this was considered as a revolt, and wars followed with several of the allies; at first

<sup>h</sup> ἄρχουσια.

<sup>i</sup> οὐλαστοκρατία.

<sup>k</sup> "The Athenians," says THUCYDIDES, i. 99, "exacted the contributions with severity; and were the more oppressive to the allies, as these were unaccustomed to oppression." But if the Athenians had not insisted on the payment of them with severity, how long would the whole confederacy have held together?

with the island of Naxos<sup>1</sup>; then with Thasos<sup>2</sup>, with Samos<sup>3</sup>, and others<sup>4</sup>. But those which had been reduced were no longer treated as allies, but as subjects; and thus the relation of Athens to the several states was different; for a distinction was made between voluntary allies and subjects<sup>5</sup>. The latter were obliged to pay in money an equivalent for the ships which they were bound to furnish; for Athens found it more advantageous to have its ships built in this manner, than at its own charge. But the matter did not rest here. The sum of the yearly tribute, fixed under Pericles at four hundred and sixty talents, was raised by Alcibiades to six hundred<sup>6</sup>. When during the Peloponnesian war, Athens suffered from want of money, the tribute was changed into a duty of five per cent. on the value of all imported articles, collected by the Athenians in the harbours of the allies<sup>7</sup>. But the most oppressive of all was, perhaps, the judiciary power which Athens usurped over the allies; not merely in the differences which arose between the states, but also in private suits<sup>8</sup>. Individuals were forced to go to Athens to transact their business, and in consequence, to the great advantage of the Athenian householders, innkeepers, and the like, a multitude of foreigners were constantly in that city, in order to obtain judgment in their suits.

<sup>1</sup> THUCYD. i. 98.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. i. 100. 101.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. i. 116.

<sup>4</sup> The difference of the allies, and also the view taken by the Athenians of their supremacy, and of the oppression with which they were charged, are nowhere more clearly developed than in the speech of the Athenian ambassador at Camarina, THUCYD. vi. 83. "The Chians," says he "and Methymnians (in Lesbos) need only furnish ships. From most of the others we exact the tribute with severity. Others, though inhabitants of islands, and easy to be taken, are yet entirely voluntary allies, on account of the situation of their islands round the Peloponnesus."

<sup>5</sup> The *αὐτόνομοι* and the *ὑπόκοτοι*, both of whom, however, were tributary (*ὑποτελεῖς*). MANSO, in his *History of Sparta*, vol. iii. appendix 12, 13. distinguishes three classes; those who contributed ships, but no money; those who contributed nothing but money; and those who were at once subject and tributary. This seems the most natural division; yet THUCYDIDES, vi. 69. does not distinguish between the two last.

<sup>6</sup> PLUTARCH. p. 535.

<sup>7</sup> THUCYD. vii. 28.

<sup>8</sup> See, upon this subject, XENOPH. *de Rep. Athen.*

*It is therefore obvious, that the nature of the Athenian supremacy was changed. It had been at first a voluntary association; but now it had become, for much the larger number of the states that shared in it, compulsory. That several of the confederates were continually striving to break loose from the alliance, has been shown by the examples cited above; but it is easy to perceive how difficult, or rather how impossible, it was to effect a general union between them against Athens. If they had been desirous of attempting it, how great were the means possessed by Athens of anticipating them. Yet there was one moment when, but for their almost inconceivable want of forethought, an attempt might have justly been expected from them; and that period was the close of the war with Persia<sup>t</sup>. The Greeks framed their articles in the final treaty of peace; and had nothing farther to fear from the Persians. The whole object of the confederacy was therefore at an end. And yet we do not hear that any voices were then raised against Athens. On the other side, it may with propriety be asked, if justice did not require of the Athenians voluntarily to restore to the allies their liberty? But this question will hardly be put by a practical statesman. To free the allies from their subordination would have been to deprive Athens of her splendour; to cut off a chief source of the revenues of the republic; perhaps to pave the way to its ruin. What Athenian statesman would have dared to make such a proposition? Had he made it, could he have carried it through? Would he not rather have ensured his own downfall? There are examples where single rulers, weary of power, have freely resigned it; but a people never yet voluntarily gave up its authority over subject nations.*

Perhaps these remarks may serve to correct the judgment of Isocrates<sup>u</sup>, who, in his celebrated oration,

<sup>t</sup> B. C. 449.

<sup>u</sup> We shall be obliged to recur frequently to Isocrates. It is impossible

considers this dominion of the sea as the source of all the misery of Athens and of Greece\*. His views were certainly just; but the evils proceeded from the abuses; and it would be just as easy to show that Athens, had it not been for that dominion, would never have afforded him a subject for his panegyrics.

But how these evils could result from that abuse; how they prepared the downfall of Athens, when the Spartans came forward as the liberators of Greece; how the rule of these liberators, far worse than that of the first oppressors, inflicted on Greece wounds which were not only deep, but incurable; and, in general, the causes which produced the ruin of that country, will furnish a subject for investigation in one of the later chapters, to which we must make our way through some previous researches.

to read this venerable orator, who was filled with the purest patriotism which a Grecian could feel, without respecting and loving him. But he was a political writer, without being a practical statesman; and, like St. Pierre and other excellent men of the same class, he believed much to be possible which was not so. The historian must consult him with caution. This panegyrist of antiquity often regarded it in too advantageous a light; nor is he sometimes very scrupulous about the accuracy of his historical statements.

\* ISOCRAT. p. 172. ed. Steph.

## CHAPTER IX.

### CONSTITUTIONS OF THE GRECIAN STATES.

IN the present chapter we do not undertake to give an outline of the several Grecian states ; but rather to delineate the general characteristics of their respective forms of government. Such a general investigation seems the more essential, as it would obviously be inconsistent with the object of this work to analyze them separately<sup>a</sup>.

With respect to a nation, in which everything that could be done in public was public ; where a man was considered more as the member of civil than of private society ; and where every private was postponed to every public duty, this investigation must have a much higher degree of interest than if it related to one in which the line of division is distinctly drawn between public and private life. He who will judge of the Greeks must be acquainted with the constitutions of their states ; and he must not only consider the inanimate forms as they are taught us by the learned compilers and writers on what are called Grecian antiquities, but regard them as they were regarded by the Greeks themselves.

If the remark which we made above<sup>b</sup>, that the Grecian states were, with few exceptions, cities with their districts, and their constitutions therefore were city

<sup>a</sup> An attempt to collect the accounts of the constitutions of the several states has been made by TRITMANN, *Darstellung der Griechischen Verfassungen*, 1822.

<sup>b</sup> In the fifth chapter.

constitutions; if this remark needed to be farther confirmed, it would be sufficient to refer to the fact, that the Greeks designate the ideas of *state* and of *city* by the same word<sup>c</sup>. We must therefore always bear in mind the idea of city constitutions, and never forget that those of which we are treating, not only had nothing in common with those of the large empires of modern times, but not even with those of the smaller principalities. If, for the sake of giving a distinct notion, we were to compare them with anything in modern history, we could best liken them (as the character of the Italian cities of the middle age is hardly more familiar than that of the Grecian) to the imperial towns in Germany, especially in the days of their prosperity, previously to the thirty years' war, before they were restrained in the freedom of their movements by the vicinity of more powerful monarchical states; were it not that the difference of religion created a dissimilarity.

And yet this comparison may throw some light on the great variety which is observed in those states, in spite of the apparent uniformity which existed among the Grecian states, (as all were necessarily similar in some respects,) and which equally existed in the German cities. And the comparison will be still more justified, if we add, that the extent of territory was as different among the Grecian cities, and yet on the whole was nearly the same. There were few which possessed a larger territory than formerly belonged to Ulm or Nuremberg; but in Greece, as in Germany, the prosperity of the city did not depend on the extent of its territory. Corinth hardly possessed a larger district than that of Augsburg; and yet both rose to a high pitch of wealth and civilization.

But great as this variety in the constitutions may

<sup>c</sup> Πόλις, *civitas*. Respecting the meaning of πόλις, and the difference between πόλις and ἡθνος, *state* and *nation*, see ARISTOT. *Polit.* p. 235. ed. Casaub.

have been, (and we shall illustrate this subject more fully hereafter,) they all coincided in one grand point. They were all *free constitutions*; that is, they allowed *of no rulers whom the people as a body, or certain classes of the people, could not call to account*<sup>d</sup>: whoever usurped such authority was, in the language of the Greeks, a tyrant. This implies the idea, that a state should govern itself, and not be governed by an individual; and, of course, a very different view of government was taken from the modern European notion. The view of the Greeks was entirely opposed to that of those modern politicians who consider a state to be a mere machine, or would make it nothing but an institution of police<sup>e</sup>. The Greeks regarded the state, no less than an individual, as a moral agent. Moral powers have influence in it, and decide its plans of operation. Hence it became the great object of him who would manage a state to ensure to reason the superiority over passion and impulse; and the attainment of virtue and morality is, in this sense as much an object of government, as it ought to be of the individual.

<sup>d</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* p. 251. 282. The magistrates were always responsible for their administration, *ἐπειθοῦντος*, as the Greeks expressed it.

<sup>e</sup> [By a *free constitution* is commonly understood a form of government according to which the making of laws does not depend on the will of an individual. If in any Greek state the legislative authority, and the power of appointing all the executive officers had been lodged in one person, the Greeks would doubtless have called the form of government a *tyrannic* or despotism, although the executive officers might have been nominally responsible for their acts. In every Greek republic, whatever might be its form, the laws were necessarily made by a sovereign uncontrollable body, and administered by supreme tribunals, responsible to no one for their acts. Hence in the *Wasps* of Aristophanes the dicast boasts that unlike all the other magistrates, he is subject to no responsibility: *kai ταῦτ' ἀνηπειθοῦντος δρῶμεν, ταῦν δὲ δῆλων οὐδέποτε' ἀρχή*, a passage which has often been misunderstood, as it has been represented as implying a *tyrannical* or *oppressive* power; whereas it merely implies that supreme, executive, judicial power, which in every state *must* reside somewhere. The author's explanation therefore does not clearly mark the distinction between legislative and executive powers, and the importance of the former in determining the form of the constitution in the ancient Greek states. The notion of a state being a mere machine, or an institution of police, mentioned in the text, may apply to some of the worst continental governments, as those of Austria, Russia, or the states of the Church; but can hardly be called generally "the modern European notion." Certainly it is not the notion prevalent in Prussia, England, or France. E.]

If with these reflections we proceed to investigate the laws of the Greeks, they will present themselves to our view in their true light. The constitutions of their cities, like those of the modern states, were framed by necessity, and developed by *circumstances*. But as abuses are much sooner felt in small states and towns than in large ones, the necessity of reform was early perceived in many of them; and this necessity occasioned lawgivers to make their appearance long before the spirit of speculation had been occupied on the subject of politics. The objects, therefore, of those lawgivers were altogether practical; and, without the knowledge of any philosophical system, they endeavoured to accomplish them by means of reflection and experience. They had no idea of a commonwealth which did not govern itself; and on this foundation they grounded their systems of legislation. It never occurred to them to leave the means of that self-government to be provided for by the forms of the constitution; and although such forms were not left unnoticed in their laws, yet they were noticed only to a certain degree. No Grecian lawgiver ever thought of entirely abolishing ancient usage, and becoming, according to the modern phrase, the framer of a new constitution. In legislating they only reformed. Lycurgus, Solon, and the others, so far from abolishing what usage had established, endeavoured to preserve everything which could be preserved; adding only several new institutions, and improving those already in existence. If, therefore, we possessed the whole of the laws of Solon, we should by no means find them to contain a perfect constitution. But to compensate for that, they embraced, not only the rights of individuals, but also morals, in a much higher degree than the latter can be embraced in the view of any modern lawgiver. The regulation of private life, and hence the education of youth<sup>1</sup>, on

<sup>1</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* p. 301. 336.

which the prevalence and continuance of good morals depend, formed one of their leading objects. They were convinced that the state would otherwise be incapable of governing itself. To this it must be added, that in these small commonwealths, in these towns with their territories, many regulations could be made and executed which could not be put into operation in a powerful and widely extended nation. Whether these regulations were always good, and always well adapted to their purpose, is quite another question; it is our duty at present to show from what point of view those lawgivers were accustomed to regard the art of regulating the state, and the means of preserving and directing it<sup>a</sup>.

Whenever a commonwealth or city governs itself, it is plain that the supreme power resides with its members, i. e. the citizens. But it may rest with the citizens collectively, or only with certain classes, or perhaps with certain families. Thus there naturally arose among the Greeks that difference which they designated by the names of aristocracies and democracies; and to one of these classes they referred all their constitutions. But it is not easy to draw a distinct line between the two. When we are speaking of the meaning which they bore in practical politics, we must be careful not to take them in the sense which was afterwards given them by the speculative politicians, by Aristotle<sup>b</sup> and others. In their practical politics, the Greeks, no doubt, connected certain ideas with those denominations; but the ideas were not very distinctly defined; and we should certainly fall into error if we attempted

<sup>a</sup> This, taken together, forms what the Greeks called *political science*—*πολιτειαὶ τέχνη*.

<sup>b</sup> Though in investigating the practical meaning of these words, we cannot make use of the theoretical definitions of Aristotle in his *Politics*, we do not therefore give up the right of citing him as authority in the history of the Greek constitutions, in so far as he himself speaks of them. And whose testimony on these subjects deserves more weight than that of the man, who, in a work which has unfortunately been lost, described and analyzed all the known forms of government of his time, two hundred and fifty-five in number?

to define them more accurately than the Greeks themselves. The characteristic of democracy was, that all citizens, as such, should enjoy equal rights in the administration of the state; and yet a perfect equality existed in very few of the cities. This equality was commonly limited to a participation in the popular assemblies and the courts of justice<sup>i</sup>. A government did not cease to be a democracy though the poorer classes were entirely excluded from all magistracies, and their votes had less weight in the popular assemblies. On the other hand, an aristocracy always implied exclusive privileges of particular classes or families. But numberless varieties and gradations existed. There were hereditary aristocracies, where, as in Sparta, the highest dignities belonged to a few families. But this was seldom the case. It was commonly the richer and more distinguished class which obtained the sole administration of the state; and it was either wealth, or birth, or both together, that decided<sup>k</sup>. But wealth consisted not so much in money as in land; and it was estimated by real property. This wealth was chiefly exhibited in ancient times in the sums expended on horses. Those whose means were sufficient constituted the cavalry of the citizens; and these formed the richer part of the soldiery, which consisted only of citizens. It is therefore easy to understand how it was possible that the circumstance, whether the district of a city possessed much level land, could have so much influence on the constitution<sup>l</sup>. These nobles, then, though they did not wholly exclude the people from a share in the legislation, endeavoured to appropriate to themselves the public offices and the seats in the courts of justice; and wherever this was the case, the

<sup>i</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iii. 1.

<sup>k</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iv. 5.

<sup>l</sup> ARISTOTLE cites examples of it in Eretria, Chalcis, and other cities, *Polit.* iv. 3.

government was what the Greeks termed an aristocracy<sup>m</sup>.

In cities, where wealth is for the most part measured by possessions in land, it is almost unavoidable that not only a class of great proprietors should rise up, but that this inequality should constantly increase; and landed estates at length fall into the hands of a few families<sup>n</sup>. In an age when there were few mechanical professions, and when those few were chiefly carried on by slaves, the consequences of this inequality were the more oppressive; and it was therefore one of the chief objects of the lawgivers, either to prevent this evil, or, where it already existed, to remedy it; as otherwise a revolution would sooner or later have inevitably followed. In this manner we may understand why a new and equal division of the land among the citizens was made<sup>o</sup>: why the acquisition of lands by purchase or gift was forbidden, and only permitted in the way of inheritance and of marriage<sup>p</sup>; why a limit was fixed to the amount of land which a single citizen could possess<sup>q</sup>. But with all these and other similar precautions, it was not possible wholly to avert the evil which they were intended to keep off; and hence were derived the causes of those numerous and violent commotions to which all the Grecian states were more or less exposed.

In a city constitution, however it may be formed, the right of citizenship is the first and most important. He who does not possess it may perhaps live in the city under certain conditions, and enjoy the protection of

<sup>m</sup> Oligarchy was distinguished from aristocracy. But though both words were in use, no other line can be drawn between them, than the greater or smaller number of nobles who had the government in their hands. That this remark is true appears from the definitions to which ARISTOTLE, *Polit.* iii. 7, is obliged to have recourse, in order to distinguish them from one another.

<sup>n</sup> This was the case at Thurii, ARISTOT. *Polit.* v. 7.

<sup>o</sup> As in Sparta, by the laws of Lycurgus.

<sup>p</sup> As in Sparta, and also among the Locrians, ARISTOT. *Polit.* ii. 7.

<sup>q</sup> ARISTOT. i. c.

its laws<sup>r</sup>; but he is not, properly speaking, a member of the state, and can enjoy neither the same rights nor the same respect as the citizen. The regulations, therefore, respecting the right of citizenship were necessarily strict; but they were very different in the several Greek cities. In some, the full privileges of citizenship were secured, if both the parents had been citizens<sup>s</sup>; in others, it was necessary to trace such a descent through two or three generations<sup>t</sup>; whilst in others no respect was had, except to the descent of the mother<sup>u</sup>. There were some cities which very rarely and with difficulty, could be induced to confer the right of citizenship; whilst in others foreigners were naturalized with readiness. In these cases accidental circumstances not unfrequently decided; and the same city was sometimes compelled to exchange its early and severe principles for milder ones, if the number of the original citizens became too small<sup>v</sup>. In colonies, the milder principles were of necessity followed; since fresh emigrants might continually arrive from the mother country, whom it would either be impossible or inexpedient to reject. And hence we may explain what is so frequently observable in the Grecian colonies, that the tribes of the citizens were divided according to their arrival from the different mother countries; one of the most fertile sources of internal commotions, and even of the most violent political revolutions<sup>y</sup>.

In free cities, the constitution and the administration are always connected in an equal degree with the division of the citizens. But here again we find a vast difference among the Greeks. We first notice those

<sup>r</sup> These *μιτρουκοι*, *inquilini*, existed in almost all the Grecian cities. It was common for them to pay for protection, and to bear other civil burthens.

<sup>s</sup> As for example, at Athens.

<sup>t</sup> As in Larissa, ARISTOT. *Polit.* iii. 2. Also at Massilia.

<sup>u</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iii. 5.

<sup>x</sup> Thus at Athens, Clisthenes received a large number of foreigners into the class of citizens.

<sup>y</sup> Examples of it at Sybaris, Thurium, Byzantium, and other places, are cited by ARISTOTLE, *Polit.* v. 3.

states which made a distinction in the privileges of the inhabitants of the chief town, and of the villages and country. There were some Greek states in which the inhabitants of the city enjoyed great privileges ; and the rest of their countrymen stood in a subordinate relation to them<sup>a</sup>; whilst in others there was no distinction of rights between the one and the other<sup>a</sup>. The other divisions of the citizens were settled, either by birth, according to the tribe to which a man happened to belong<sup>b</sup>; from his place of residence, according to the district in which he resided<sup>c</sup>; or from property, (by the census,) according to the class in which he was rated. Though not in all, yet in many states, the tribe and the place of residence were attached to the name of each individual ; which was absolutely necessary in a nation that had no family names, or where they at least were not generally used. There is no need of mentioning how important was the difference in fortune ; as the proportion of the public burthen to be borne by each was decided by his wealth ; and the kind of service to be required in war, whether in the cavalry or the infantry, and whether in heavy or light armour, was regulated by the same criterion ; as will ever be the case in countries where there is no other armed force than the militia formed of the citizens.

On these divisions of the citizens, the organization of the public assemblies (*ἐκκλησίαι*) was founded. These assemblies, which were a natural result of city governments, were, according to the views of the Greeks, so essential an institution, that they probably existed in every Grecian city, though not always under the same regulations. Yet the manner in which they were held in every city, except Athens and Sparta, is almost wholly unknown to us. It is certain, however, that

<sup>a</sup> Hence in Laconia, the difference between Spartans and ~~Macedonians~~ <sup>Macedonians</sup> (*περιόουκοι*). So also in Crete and in Argos.

<sup>a</sup> As at Athens.

<sup>b</sup> According to the *φυλαῖ*, or tribes.

<sup>c</sup> According to the *δῆμοι*, or boroughs.

this must everywhere have been established by rule. It was the custom to give to one magistrate the right of convoking and opening them<sup>d</sup>. But we do not know in what manner the votes were taken in the several cities, whether singly, or by the tribes and other divisions of the people. And in this, too, there was a great difference, whether all citizens had the right of voting, or whether a certain amount of property was requisite<sup>e</sup>. In most of the cities, regular assemblies seem to have been held on fixed days, with occasional extraordinary meetings<sup>f</sup>. To attend was regarded as the duty of every citizen; and as the wealthier and more educated citizens were apt to remain away, especially in disturbed times, absence was often made a punishable offence<sup>g</sup>. It may easily be supposed that the decisions were expressed in some established form, written down and preserved, and sometimes engraved on tablets. But although the forms were fixed, the subjects which might come before the assembly were by no means so clearly defined. The principle observed was, that subjects which were important to the community were to be brought before it. But how vague and indefinite is the very idea of what is or is not important. How much too depends on the form which the constitution has taken at a certain period; whether the power of the senate, or of certain magistrates, preponderates. We find even in the history of Rome, that questions of the utmost interest to the people, questions of war and peace, were sometimes submitted to the people, and sometimes not. A difference equally considerable prevailed in the Greek cities. Yet writers are accustomed to divide the subjects belonging to the

<sup>d</sup> In the heroic age it was the privilege of the kings to convene the assembly. See above, c. 4.

<sup>e</sup> That a great variety prevailed in this respect, is clear from ARISTOT. *Polit.* iv. 13.

<sup>f</sup> This was the case at Athens and Sparta.

<sup>g</sup> This is the case, says ARISTOTLE, *Polit.* iv. 13, in the oligarchical or aristocratical cities; while, on the contrary, in the democratical, the poor were paid for appearing in the assemblies.

popular assemblies into three grand classes<sup>h</sup>. The first embraces legislation; for what the Greeks called a law (*vōμος*) was always a decree passed, or confirmed by the people; although it is difficult, or perhaps impossible, to define with accuracy the extent of this legislation. The second embraces the choice of magistrates. This right (although all magistrates were not appointed by election) was regarded, and justly regarded, as one of the most important privileges. For the power of the people is in no way preserved more effectually, than by making it necessary for those who would obtain an office to apply for it to them. The third comprehends the subjects laid before the popular courts of justice, which, as we shall hereafter take occasion to show, were of the highest importance in support of a democracy.

The consequences which the discussion and the decision of the most important concerns in the assemblies of the whole commons must inevitably have had, are so naturally suggested, that they hardly need to be illustrated at large. How could it have escaped those law-givers, that to intrust this unlimited power to the commons, was not much less than to pave the way for the rule of the populace, if we include under that name the mass of indigent citizens?

The most natural means of guarding against this evil, would, without doubt, have been the choice of persons possessed of plenary powers to represent the citizens. But it is obvious that the system of representation has the least opportunity of being brought to perfection in city governments. It is the fruit of the enlarged extent of states, where it is impossible for all to meet in the national assembly. But in cities with a narrow territory, nothing could lead to such a form; since neither distance nor numbers made it difficult for the citizens to appear personally in the assemblies. It

<sup>h</sup> On this subject see ARISTOT., *Polit.* iv. 14.

is true that the alliances of several cities, as of the Boeotian or the Achæan, led to the idea of sending deputies to the assemblies; but in those meetings, the internal affairs of the confederates were never discussed; they were reserved for the consideration of each city; and the deliberations of the whole body related only to foreign affairs. But a true system of representation can never be formed in that manner; the proper business of a legislative body is the internal affairs of the nation.

It was, therefore, necessary to devise other means of meeting the danger apprehended from the rule of the populace; and those means were various. Aristotle remarks<sup>i</sup>, that there were some cities in which no general assemblies of the citizens were held; and only such citizens appeared as had been expressly summoned. These obviously formed a class of aristocratic governments. But even in the democracies, means<sup>k</sup> were taken, partly to have the important business transacted in smaller divisions before the people came to vote upon it; partly to limit the subjects which were to be brought before them; partly to reserve the revision, if not of all, yet of some, of the decrees to another separate body; and partly, and most frequently, to name another deliberative assembly, whose duty it was to consider everything which was to come before the people, and so far to prepare the business, that nothing remained for the people but to accept or reject the measures proposed.

This assembly was called by the Greeks a senate (*βουλὴ*). We are acquainted with its internal regulations only at Athens; but there is no reason to doubt, that in several Grecian states, a similar assembly ex-

<sup>i</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iii. 1. A similar regulation existed in several German imperial towns; as, for example, at Bremen, where the most distinguished citizens were invited by the senate to attend the convention of citizens; and of course no uninvited person made his appearance. It is to be regretted that Aristotle has cited no Grecian city as an example.

<sup>k</sup> See in proof of what follows, ARISTOT. *Polit.* iv. 14.

isted under the same name<sup>1</sup>. If we may draw inferences respecting its nature in other states from what it was at Athens, it consisted of a numerous committee of the citizens annually chosen; its members, taken after a fixed rule from each of the corporations, were chosen by lot; but they could not become actual members without a previous examination. For in no other case was it of so much importance to effect the exclusion of all but honest men; who, being themselves interested in the preservation of the state and its constitution, might decide with prudence and moderation on the affairs laid before them. In Athens, at least, the greatest pains were taken to provide proper members of this body; so that it seems, as will appear from the investigations respecting this state, to have been almost too artificial. Regulations, similar in kind, though not exactly the same, were probably established in the other cities, where similar wants and circumstances prevailed. It is easy to perceive that the preservation of the internal liberties of such a body against the encroachments of parties and too powerful individuals, made such regulations essential. It was probably to promote this end, that the appointments to the senate were made only for a year<sup>m</sup>. It prevented the committee from becoming a faction, and thus assuming the whole administration of the state. But, besides this, another great advantage was gained; for, in consequence of this annual change, much the larger number of distinguished and upright citizens became acquainted with the affairs and the government of the state.

In other cities, instead of this annual senate, there was a council (*γερουσία*,) which had no periodical change of its members, but formed a permanent board. Its very name expresses that it was composed of the

<sup>1</sup> As at Argos and Mantinea, THUCYD. v. 47. So too in Chios, THUCYD. viii. 14.

<sup>m</sup> This explains why ARISTOTLE, *Polit.* iv. 15, calls the *Bouλή* an institution favourable to the popular form of government.

elders; and what was more natural than to look for good counsel to the experience of age? The period of admission may have been very different in the several cities, and perhaps in many no rule on the subject existed. But in others it was enforced with rigorous accuracy. The immediate object was to have in it a board of council; but its sphere of action was by no means so limited. In Sparta the assembly of elders had its place by the side of the kings. The council of Corinth is mentioned under the same name<sup>n</sup>; that of Massilia<sup>o</sup> under a different one, but its members held their places for life; and in how many other cities may there not have been a council of elders, of which history makes no mention, just as it is silent respecting the internal regulations in those just enumerated<sup>p</sup>? Even in cities which usually had no such council, an extraordinary one was sometimes appointed in extraordinary cases, when good advice was needed. This took place in Athens after the great defeat in Sicily<sup>q</sup>.

Besides an assembly of citizens and a senate, a Grecian city had its magistrates. Even the ancient politicians were perplexed to express with accuracy the idea of magistrates<sup>r</sup>. For not all to whom public business was committed by the citizens, could be called magistrates; since in this case the ambassadors and priests would have been included. In modern constitutions

<sup>n</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. ii. p. 177.

<sup>o</sup> STRABO, iii. p. 124.

<sup>p</sup> There was perhaps no Greek city in which such a council did not exist; for it was almost indispensable. They were most commonly called *βούλη* and *γερουσία*, and these words were perhaps often confounded. For although the *βούλη* in Athens was a body chosen from the citizens but for a year, and the *γερουσία* of Sparta was a permanent council, we cannot safely infer, that the terms, when used, always implied such a difference. In Crete, e. g. the council of elders was called *βούλη*, according to ARISTOT. *Polit.* ii. 10. though in its organization it resembled the *γερουσία* of Sparta.

<sup>q</sup> THUCYD. viii. 1.

<sup>r</sup> See, on this subject, ARISTOT. *Polit.* iv. 15. The practical politicians, no less than the theorists, were perplexed in defining the word. An important passage may be found in HECHER, in *Ctesiphont.* p. 397 sqq. Reisk.

it is frequently difficult to decide who ought to be reckoned *magistrates*, as will be apparent from calling to mind the inferior officers. But no important misunderstanding can arise, if we are careful to affix to the word the double idea of possessing a part of the executive power; and of gaining, in consequence of the importance of the business intrusted to them, a higher degree of consideration than belonged to the common citizen.

In the republican constitutions of the Greeks, a second idea was attached to that of a magistracy; it was necessary to call every magistrate to account for the affairs of his office<sup>a</sup>. He who refused to submit to this rule ceased to be a magistrate, and became a tyrant. The magistrate was therefore compelled to recognise the sovereignty of the people. This certainly implied that an account was to be given to the popular assembly; but as in such constitutions many things were not systematically established, there were some states in which separate boards, as that of the ephors at Sparta, usurped the right of calling the magistrates to account<sup>b</sup>.

"In considering the subject of magistrates," says Aristotle<sup>c</sup>, "several questions are to be considered; How many magistrates there are, and how great is their authority? How long they continue in office, and whether they ought to continue long? Again,— Who ought to be appointed? and by whom? and how?" These questions of themselves show that republican states are alluded to; and lead us to anticipate that great variety which prevailed on these points in the Grecian constitutions. We shall first examine the last of these questions.

According to the whole spirit of the Grecian con-

<sup>a</sup> They were of necessity ὑπεύθυνοι, ARISTOT. *Polit.* ii. 12.

<sup>b</sup> There were magistrates appointed on purpose, called εὑθυνοί and λογισταί, ARISTOT. *Polit.* vi. 8.

<sup>c</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iv. 15.

stitutions, it cannot be doubted, that their leading principle was that all magistrates were appointed by the people. The right of choosing the magistrates was always, and justly, regarded as an important part of the franchises of a citizen<sup>x</sup>. But although this principle was predominant, it still had its exceptions. There were states in which the first offices were hereditary in certain families<sup>y</sup>. But, as we have already observed, this was a rare case; and sometimes where one magistracy was hereditary, all the rest were elective; thus at Sparta, though the royal dignity was hereditary, the ephors were chosen by the people. But beside the nomination by election, the custom very commonly prevailed of choosing public officers by lot. Our astonishment is justly excited, that by this method the appointment to the first and most weighty employments in the state should not unfrequently have been committed to chance. However, in several of the German imperial towns, the appointment to offices was in a great measure regulated by lot. It is uninfluenced by favour, birth, and wealth. And therefore the nomination of magistrates by lot was considered, by the Grecian politicians, as the surest characteristic of a democracy<sup>z</sup>. But where the appointment was decided by that method, the decision was not always made solely by it. He on whom the lot fell could still be subjected to a severe examination, and very frequently was so. And where some offices were filled in this way, it was not applied in the appointment of all.

But in nominations by election the greatest differences also prevailed; since sometimes all and sometimes only particular classes took part in them<sup>a</sup>. The admission of all citizens to vote was one of the chief characteristics of a democracy; and we know this was

<sup>x</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* ii. 12. Μηδὲ γάρ τούτου [τοῦ τάξ ἀρχὰς αἱρεῖσθαι καὶ εὐθύνειν] κύριος ὁν δῆμος, ἐνέλυς ἀν εἴη καὶ πολέμιος.

<sup>y</sup> As the kings of Sparta.

<sup>z</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iv. 15. <sup>a</sup> ARISTOTLE, l. c. classifies these varieties.

done not only in Athens, but in many other cities. But when the aristocratical and democratical parties had once become distinct, endeavours were almost inevitably made to exclude the mass of the people from any share in the elections. For the aristocrat found nothing more humiliating than to approach the common citizen as a suppliant, before he could be admitted to places of honour. Where the first step succeeded, the second soon followed ; and the magistrates themselves supplied any vacant places in their own number. "This," says Aristotle<sup>b</sup>, "is the peculiar mark of oligarchy, and frequently leads to revolutions in the states."

The next point is, who is eligible to office ? This question is still more important than that respecting the electors ; and an equally wide difference prevailed on this point in the various states. The maxim that men, to whom the control of the public affairs should be committed, must not only possess sufficient capacity, but must also be interested in the support of the existing state of things, is so obvious, that the principle of excluding the lower orders from participating in the magistracies appeared not only politic, but even necessary<sup>c</sup>. But when it was adopted, it could seldom be maintained. When a state became flourishing and powerful, the people became sensible of their increased importance<sup>d</sup>; and it was not always flattery of the populace, which in such times induced its leaders to abolish those restrictive laws, but a conviction of the impossibility of maintaining them. In an individual case, such an unlimited freedom of choice may become very injurious ; but it is, on the whole, much less so than it appears to be ; and the restrictions are apt to become pernicious. If it be birth which forms the

<sup>b</sup> ARISTOT. l. c.

<sup>c</sup> That not only Solon, but other lawgivers, had adopted this regulation is remarked by ARISTOTLE, *Polit.* iii. 11.

<sup>d</sup> See on this subject also ARISTOT. l. c.

limiting principle, if a man must be of one of certain families in order to gain an office, it would be absolutely impossible for men of talent to obtain them; and this often produced violent revolutions. If fortune be made the qualification<sup>e</sup>, this is in itself no criterion of merit. If it be age, want of energy is too often connected with riper experience.

In most of the Grecian cities there certainly was a reason why regard should be had to wealth; because that almost always consisted of landed property. But where the poor were excluded by no restrictive laws, they were obliged to retire voluntarily from most of the magistracies. These offices were not lucrative; indeed considerable expenses were often connected with them<sup>f</sup>. There were no fixed salaries as in modern states; and the prospect, which at Rome at a later period was so inviting to the magistrates, viz. the administration of a province, did not exist in Greece. It was therefore impossible for the poorer class to press forward with eagerness to these offices; in many cities it was even found necessary to inflict a punishment, if the person elected would not accept the office assigned to him<sup>g</sup>. It was far more the honour and glory than the gain, which gave a value to the magistracies. But the honour of being the first, or one of the first, among his fellow-citizens, is for many a more powerful excitement than any that can be derived from emolument.

In small republics the only danger to be apprehended respecting the public offices is, that certain families (usually those of the greatest wealth) should gain the exclusive possession of them. This, when the number of such families was small, is what the Greeks meant by an oligarchy<sup>h</sup>; and it was with justice regarded as a corruption of an aristocratical

<sup>e</sup> Many passages in ARISTOTLE show that this was the case in numerous cities; and under the most various regulations; e. g. iv. 11.

<sup>f</sup> As for banquets, public buildings, festivals, etc. ARISTOT. *Polit.* vi. 8.

<sup>g</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iv. 9.

<sup>h</sup> Not only ARISTOTLE, iv. 6. but many passages in THUCYDIDES; as, e. g. viii. 82.

form of government. There may have been exceptions, and we find in history examples both within and without Greece, of such states having been administered with moderation and wisdom. But more frequently experience has shown the contrary result. The precautions taken against this evil by the Greeks were the same as those adopted in many of the German imperial towns; persons connected by blood, as father and son, or brothers, were prohibited from being at the same time magistrates<sup>i</sup>. Connections by marriage are nowhere said to have excluded from office; indeed we find examples of brothers-in-law filling magistracies at the same time<sup>k</sup>.

Most of the magistrates were chosen annually; many for only half a year<sup>l</sup>. This frequent renewal had its advantages, and also its evils. It is the strongest pillar of popular government; which is by nothing so much confirmed as by the frequent exercise of the right of election. This was the point of view taken by the politicians of Greece, when they considered the authority of the people to reside in the elections<sup>m</sup>. That these frequent elections did not tend to preserve internal tranquillity, is easy to be perceived. But on the other side, the philosopher of Stagirus has not failed to remark, that the permanent possession of magistracies might lead to discontent<sup>n</sup>.

An enumeration of the different magistracies usual among the Greeks, is not requisite for our purpose; neither would it be possible, as our acquaintance with the several constitutions of the cities is very limited<sup>o</sup>. The little that we know of the regulations in the individual states, especially at Athens, proves that the number of such offices was very considerable; and the

<sup>i</sup> It was so at Massilia and Cnidos, ARISTOT. *Polit.* v. 6.

<sup>k</sup> As Agesilaus and Pisander at Sparta.

<sup>l</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iv. 15.

<sup>m</sup> THUCYD. viii. 89.

<sup>n</sup> ARIST. *Polit.* ii. 5.

<sup>o</sup> On this point see TITTMANN's *Darstellung der Griechischen Stadtverfassungen*.

same appears from the classification which Aristotle has attempted to make of them<sup>p</sup>. Their duties are commonly indicated by their names; but these again were very different in the various cities; even in cases where the duties were the same. The cosmi were in Crete what the ephors were at Sparta. Most of the cities probably had magistrates like the archons of Athens; and yet it would not be easy to find the name in any other. The numerous encroachments of the lawgivers on domestic life contributed much to increase the number of public offices, and extend their sphere of action. The Greeks had formed no idea of a police, as a branch of the administration of the state; but they had separate offices belonging to particular departments of it, and indeed some which are not usual in modern times. The superintendence of women and of children was in many cities intrusted to particular magistrates<sup>q</sup>; and as the Areopagus of Athens had in general the care of morals, so there were undoubtedly similar tribunals in other Grecian cities.

Thus then it appears, that amidst an almost infinite variety of forms, assemblies of citizens, senates, and public offices, are the institutions which belonged to every Grecian commonwealth. The preservation of freedom and equality among the citizens<sup>r</sup> formed their chief object. It was not considered unjust to take from any one, by a temporary banishment from the city, if it was feared that he might become dangerous to this freedom, the power of doing injury; and this was effected at Athens and Argos<sup>s</sup> by ostracism, and by petalism at Syracuse. Nothing can be more jealous than the love of liberty; and, unfortunately for mankind, experience shows too clearly that it has reason to be so.

<sup>p</sup> See the instructive passage, *Polit.* iv. 15.

<sup>q</sup> The γυναικονόμοι and the παιδονόμοι, ARISTOT. l. c.

<sup>r</sup> Αὐτονομία and ἴσονομία. [Αὐτονομία means independence of foreign domination : ἴσονομία means equality of political rights among the citizens : E.]

<sup>s</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* v. 3.

Nevertheless, neither these nor other precautions were able to save the Grecian cities from the usurpations of *tyrants*, as they were termed. Few cities, either in the mother country or the colonies, escaped this fate. The Grecians connected with this word the idea of an illegitimate, but not necessarily of a cruel government. It was illegitimate, because it was not conferred by the people; but usurped without or even against their will. A demagogue, whatever might be his power, was never, as such, denominated a tyrant; but he received the name, if he set himself above the people; that is, if he refused to lay before the people the account which was due to them<sup>t</sup>. The usual support of such an authority was an armed power, composed of foreigners and hirelings; which was therefore always regarded as the sure mark of tyranny<sup>u</sup>. Such a government did not necessarily imply that the existing regulations and laws were entirely set aside. They might indeed, to a certain point, remain in force; for even a tyrant requires some executive authorities; but he raises himself above the laws. The natural aim of these tyrants usually was to make their power hereditary in their families. But though this happened in many cities, the supreme power was seldom retained for a long time by the same family. It continued longest, says Aristotle\*, in the dynasty of Orthagoras at Sicyon; which, as their rule was moderate and even popular, lasted a century; and for the same causes it was preserved about as long by the family of Cypselus at Corinth. But if it could not be maintained by such means, how could it have been kept up by mere violence and terror? Where the love of freedom is once so deeply fixed, as it was in the character of the Greeks, the attempts to oppress it only give a new impulse to its defenders.

<sup>t</sup> By desiring to become ἀρνητέοντας. ARISTOT. *Polit.* iii. 10. See above, p. 137, 138.

<sup>u</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* iii. 14. *Rhet.* i. 2. 19.

\* ARISTOT. *Polit.* v. 12.

And by what criterion shall the historian, who investigates the history of mankind, form his judgment of the value of these constitutions? By that which a modern school, limiting the end of government to the security of person and of property, desires to see adopted. We may observe in Greece exertions made to gain that security; but it is equally clear, that it was very imperfectly attained, and with such constitutions could have been but imperfectly attained<sup>y</sup>. In the midst of the frequent storms to which every state was exposed, that tranquillity could not long be preserved, in which men limit their active powers to the improvement of their domestic condition. It is not our duty to institute inquiries into the correctness of those principles; but experience has proved that in these, to all appearance so imperfect constitutions, everything that forms the glory of man flourished in its highest perfection. It was these very troubles which called forth master minds, by opening to them a wide sphere of action. There was here no room for indolence and inactivity of mind; where each individual felt, most sensibly, that he existed only through the state and with the state; where every revolution in some measure inevitably affected him; and the security of person and property was necessarily much less firmly established than in well-regulated monarchies. We leave to every one to form his own judgment, and select his own criterion; but we will draw from the whole one general inference, that the forms under which the character of the human race can be unfolded, have not been so limited by the hand of the Eternal, as the wisdom of the schools would lead us to believe.

But whatever may be thought of the goodness of these forms of government, the reflection is forced upon us, that they surpassed all others in internal variety; and therefore in no other nation could so

<sup>y</sup> See TITTMANN, in his first and second book.

great an abundance of political ideas have been awakened and preserved in practical circulation. Of the hundreds of Grecian cities, perhaps there were no two whose constitutions were perfectly alike; and none whose internal relations had not changed their form. How much had been tried in each one of them, and how often had the experiments been repeated! And did not each of these experiments enrich the science of politics with new results? Where then could there have been so much political animation, so large an amount of practical knowledge, as among the Greeks? If uniformity is, in the political world, as in the regions of taste and letters, the parent of ignorance, while variety, on the contrary, promotes knowledge, no nation ever moved in a better course than the Greeks. Although some cities became preeminent, no single city engrossed everything; the splendour of Athens could as little eclipse that of Corinth and Sparta, as of Miletus and Syracuse. Each city had a life of its own, its own mode of existence and action; and it was because each one had a consciousness of its own excellence, that each came to possess an independent value.

## CHAPTER X.

### THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE GREEKS.

THE increasing wants of modern states have not only employed practical statesmen, but have led to the formation of many theories, the truth and applicability of which are still subjects of discussion. Among the ancients, the finances of a nation were not regarded in so high a point of view, and therefore could not be in the same degree an object of speculation. Whether the world has lost by this, or not, is a question which we must leave unanswered. If the ancients knew less of the importance of the division of labour, they were also less acquainted with the doctrine of the modern schools, which transforms nations into mere productive animals. The Greeks were aware that men must have productive arts if they would live; but, that it is the chief end of society to be employed in them never entered their minds.

The modern, however, should not look with absolute contempt on the state of political science among the ancients. The chief question, once agitated between modern theorists and practical statesmen, whether the amount of precious metals constitutes the wealth of a nation, and should form the object of its industry, was correctly understood and answered by the illustrious Stagirite. "Many," says he<sup>a</sup>, "suppose wealth to consist in the abundance of coined money, because it is the object of usury and commerce. Money

<sup>a</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* i. 9.

is of itself without value, and gains its utility only by the law; when it ceases to be current it loses its value<sup>b</sup>, and cannot be employed in the satisfaction of man's wants; and therefore one who is rich in money may yet be destitute of the means of subsistence. But it is ridiculous to say that wealth consists in anything of which a man may be possessed and yet die of hunger; as the fable relates of Midas, at whose touch every thing became gold<sup>c</sup>."

In a nation in which private existence was subordinate to that of the public, the industry employed in the increase of wealth could not gain the exclusive importance which it has among the moderns. With the ancients, the first care of the citizen was for the state, the next for himself. As long as there is any higher object than the acquisition of money, the love of self cannot manifest itself so fully as where every higher object is wanting. While religion in modern Europe engaged the chief attention of states as of individuals, the science of finances could not be fully developed, although the want of money was often very sensibly felt. Men learned to tread under foot the most glorious productions of mind, to trample upon the monuments of moral and intellectual greatness, before they received those theories which assign to the great instructors of mankind in philosophy and in religion a place in the unproductive class. In the states of Greece each individual was obliged to say that his own welfare was connected with the welfare of the state; that it would be ruined by a revolution in the existing order of things, either by the rule of the populace, or by subjection to a foreign power; that all his industry was of advantage to him only while the state should

<sup>b</sup> "Οτι μεταθεμένων τῶν χρωμάτων οὐδὲν δύο ἀξιον οὐδὲ χρήσιμον πρὸς οὐδὲν τῶν ἀγαγκαλίων ἐστί. I understand χρωμένων as referring to the cities or states, "when the cities which hitherto used money, alter it."

<sup>c</sup> Aristotle found in the traditions of Greece a more suitable example than usually cited respecting the man who had abundance of gold on a desert island.

continue to subsist. Although the patriotism thus produced proceeded frequently from selfishness, the necessary consequence was, that the exertions of the individual were directed to something besides his private advantage, and that his private welfare was less regarded than that of the public. The times arrived when this principle also was reversed; but they were the precursors of the ruin of liberty.

There was yet another reason which contributed to make the Greeks regard the arts of industry in general, and some of them in particular, in a very different light from that in which they are now considered. I mean the institution of slavery, so generally prevalent, either under the form of domestic servitude, or, in some states, of villenage.

To be convinced of this, we need only look at the variety of employments which were carried on by slaves and villeins. Such were all those household duties which with us are committed to menial servants; and beside them several other charges, as the superintendence, and in part the early education and instruction, of children. Vanity still more than necessity increased the number of these bondsmen, after it had become the custom to be served by a numerous retinue of beautiful slaves. In the same manner all labour was performed which is now done by journeymen and mechanics. Some of the rich Greeks made a business of keeping slaves to let for such services. All kinds of labour in the mines were performed by slaves, who, as well as the mines, were the property of individual citizens<sup>d</sup>. The sailors on board the galleys consisted, at least in part, of slaves. Most, if not all, trades were carried on by slaves, who were universally employed in the manufacturing establishments. In these not only the labourers but also the overseers were slaves; for the owners did not even trouble themselves with the care

of superintending, but farmed the whole to persons who were perhaps often the overseers also, and from whom they received a certain rent, according to the number of slaves, which they were obliged to keep undiminished<sup>e</sup>. In those states where there were slaves attached to the soil, as in Laconia, Messenia, Crete, and Thessaly, agriculture was conducted exclusively by them. In the others, the masters perhaps bestowed more attention on the subject; but, as the example of Strepsiades in the *Clouds* shows, they did little more than superintend; the work being left to the slaves.

From this we see how limited were the branches of industry which remained for the free citizens. But the most unavoidable, and at the same time the most important consequence was, that all those employments which were committed to slaves were regarded as mean and degrading<sup>f</sup>; and this view of them was not only confirmed by prevailing prejudices, but expressly sanctioned by the laws. To this class belonged especially the mechanics, and even the retail traders. For though by no means all mechanical employments were conducted by slaves, yet they were held in a certain degree of disrepute. "A well-regulated state," says Aristotle<sup>g</sup>, "would not admit mechanics to the rights of citizenship;" and hence we may cease to wonder at the proposition of another statesman<sup>h</sup>, to commit all mechanical labours to public slaves. Nor was this a mere theory; it was once actually put in practice at Epidamnus<sup>i</sup>. In the democratical cities, the condition of the mechanics was somewhat more favourable. They could become citizens and magistrates, as at Athens during the democracy<sup>k</sup>. The inferior branches of

<sup>e</sup> See *Petit. de Leg. Att.* ii. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Βάναυσοι, *artes illiberales*. We have no word which exactly expresses this idea, because we have not the thing itself.

<sup>g</sup> Αν. STOT. *Polit.* iii. 5. Ἡ δὲ βελτίστη πόλις οὐ ποιήσει βάναυσον πολίτην

<sup>h</sup> Phœbes of Chalcedon, ARISTOT. *Polit.* ii. 7.

<sup>i</sup> Αν. STOT. *Polit.* i. c.

<sup>k</sup> Αν. STOT. *Polit.* iii. 4.

trade were not looked upon with much more favour. At Thebes there was a law, that no one who within ten years had been engaged in retail dealings could be elected to a magistracy<sup>1</sup>.

As the Grecian cities were very different in character, the ideas which prevailed on this subject could not be the same in all. In those states where agriculture was the chief employment, the other means of gaining a livelihood were despised. In maritime and commercial towns, of which the number was very considerable, the business of commerce must have been esteemed. But those who were employed in manufacturing and selling goods, were never able to gain that degree of respectability which they enjoy among modern nations<sup>m</sup>. Even in Athens, says Xenophon<sup>n</sup>, much would be gained by treating more respectfully and more hospitably the foreign merchants, brought by their business to that city. The income derived from landed property was most esteemed by the Greeks. "The best nation," says Aristotle<sup>o</sup>, "is a nation of agriculturists."

From the little esteem in which the other means of gaining a livelihood were held, it followed that a wealthy middle class could not be formed in the Grecian states; and this is censured, by those who have criticised their constitutions, as the chief cause of their unsettled condition. But this censure rests, for the most part, on an erroneous supposition. It was degrading for a Greek to carry on any of those kinds of employment with his own hands; but it by no means lessened his consideration to have them conducted on his account. Workshops and manufactories, as well as mines and lands, could be possessed by the first men in the country. The father of Demosthenes, a

<sup>1</sup> ARISTOT. l. c.

<sup>m</sup> Compare on this subject, ARIST. vi. *Polit.* 1. 11. where he analyzes and treats of the several branches of industry.

<sup>n</sup> XENOPH. *de Vectig.* p. 922. Leunclav.

<sup>o</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* vi. 4.

rich and respectable man, left at his death a manufactory of swords, which was kept up by his son<sup>r</sup>; and examples could be easily multiplied from the orators and Aristophanes. When this circumstance is kept in view, the blame attached to the Grecian institutions is in a great measure, though not entirely, removed. The impediments which public opinion threw in the way of industry did not so much injure those concerned in any large enterprise, as those who carried on business upon a more limited scale. The evil was felt by this latter class, and we are not disposed to represent it as inconsiderable.

But we must return once more to the remark which explains the true cause of this regulation; viz. that in the Greek states the convenience of private individuals was considered as subordinate to the good of the community. "All agree," says Aristotle<sup>a</sup>, "that in every well-regulated state sufficient leisure must be preserved from the wants of life for public business; but a difference of opinion exists as to the manner in which this should be done. It is effected by means of slaves; who are not, however, treated in all places alike." We here perceive the light in which the Greek politician considered the institution of slavery. It served to raise the class of citizens to a sort of nobility, especially where they consisted almost entirely of landed proprietors. It is true that this class lived by the labours of the other; and everything that in modern times has been said respecting and against slavery, may therefore so far be applied to the Greeks. But their fame does not rest on the circumstance of their obtaining that leisure at the expense of the lower order; but in the application which the best of them made of that leisure. No one will deny that without their slaves the upper classes in Greece would never have attained that pre-eminence in mental acquirements to which they ac-

<sup>r</sup> DEMOSTH. *adv. Aphob.* p. 816.

<sup>a</sup> ARISTOT. ii. 9.

tually reached; and if the fruits of this pre-eminence possess a value for every cultivated mind, we may at least be permitted to doubt whether they were too dearly purchased by the introduction of slavery<sup>r</sup>.

The free exertions of industry were in some measure limited by the regulations of which we have spoken; but in a very different manner from any that are usual in our times. They were the result of public opinion; and if confirmed by the laws, this was done in conformity to that opinion. In other respects, the interference of government in this matter was inconsiderable. It was not considered as an object to preserve the circulation undiminished, or to increase it; nothing was known of the balance of trade, and consequently all the violent measures resulting from it were unknown to the Greeks. They had duties as well as the moderns; but those duties were exacted only for the sake of increasing the public revenue, not to direct the efforts of domestic industry by the prohibition of certain commodities. There was no prohibition of the exportation of the raw produce for this purpose<sup>s</sup>; no encouragement of manufactures at the expense of the agriculturists. In this respect, therefore, there existed a freedom of industry, commerce, and trade. And such was the general custom. As everything was decided by circumstances and not by theories, there may have been single exceptions, and perhaps single examples<sup>t</sup>, where the state for a season usurped a

<sup>r</sup> This may be the more safely asserted, as it is hardly possible to say anything in general on the condition of slaves in Greece; so different was it at different times, in different countries, and even in the same country. On this subject I would refer to the following instructive work; *Geschichte und Zustand der Sklaverey und Leibwirenschaft in Griechenland*, von J. F. REITEMEYER, Berlin, 1789. History and Condition of Slavery and Vil- lenage in Greece, by J. F. REITEMEYER.

<sup>s</sup> I do not mean to deny that in Athens and other states there were prohibitions to export raw products, as articles of food, especially corn, whenever they were needed at home. My remarks in the text only refer to prohibitions for the sake of encouraging domestic industry, as e. g. of the exportation of raw wool. See BOECKH's *Public Economy of Athens*, vol. i. p. 56. [p. 71. Eng. Transl.]

<sup>t</sup> ARISTOT. (*Econ.* ii.)

monopoly. But how far was this from the mercantile and restrictive system of the moderns.

Before we proceed to speak of the economy of the state, properly so called, it will be desirable to make some remarks on the monetary system of the Greeks.

It would be important to fix the time when coined money first became current in Greece, and when money was first coined in the country itself. But it is difficult to give an exact answer to either of these questions, especially to the first. Homer never speaks of money; and his silence is in this case conclusive; for in more than one passage where he speaks of barter<sup>u</sup>, he must necessarily have mentioned it, had he been acquainted with it. On the other hand, we may confidently affirm on the authority of Demosthenes, that in the age of Solon<sup>x</sup>, coined silver money was not only known in the cities of Greece, but had been in circulation for a considerable time<sup>y</sup>; for the punishment of death had already been set upon the crime of counterfeiting it; Solon mentioned it as in general use throughout Greece; and many of them had already supplied its place with the baser metals. The Greek coins which are still extant, can afford us no accurate dates, as the time of their coinage is not marked upon them; but several of them are certainly as ancient as the age Solon; and perhaps even of an earlier date. The coins of Sybaris, for example, must be at least of the sixth century before the Christian era; as that city

<sup>u</sup> For example, *Ili.* vi. 472. *Od.* i. 430.

<sup>x</sup> About 600 B. C.

<sup>y</sup> "I will relate to you," says the orator, while opposing a law introduced by Timocrates, "what Solon once said against a man who proposed a bad law. The cities, said he to the judges, have a law, that he who counterfeits money shall be put to death. He thought this law was made for the protection of private persons and their private intercourse; but the laws he esteemed the coin of the state. They, therefore, who corrupt the laws must be much more heavily punished than they who adulterate the coinage or introduce false money. Yea, many cities exist and flourish, although they use brass and lead instead of silver money; but those which have bad laws will certainly be ruined." DEMOSTH. in *Timocrat.* p. 763. 764. Compare with this what HEROD. iii. 56. says of the counterfeit money with which Polycrates is said to have cheated the Spartans.

was totally destroyed in the year 510 B. C. The most ancient coins of Rhegium, Croton, and Syracuse, seem from the form of the letters to be even of higher antiquity<sup>z</sup>. If the account that Lycurgus prohibited in Sparta the use of money of the precious metals, is authentic<sup>a</sup>, we should be able to trace the history of Greek coins to a still more remote age; and this opinion is corroborated at least by the statement of the Parian chronicle<sup>b</sup>, that Phidon and Argos in the year 631 (i. e. 895 B. C.) first began to coin silver in the island of Ægina.

But although at present we cannot any farther trace the history of coined money in Greece<sup>c</sup>, we may, from the preceding observations, collect one general conclusion; the founding of colonies, and the intercourse kept up with them, caused coined money to be introduced and extensively used in Greece. Before their foundation the Greeks knew nothing of coined money. When money was first coined in Ægina, the colonies of Asia Minor and of Magna Graecia<sup>d</sup> were already established and flourishing; and we are expressly informed that money was coined in that island, in order to carry on commerce beyond the sea<sup>e</sup>. It cannot be proved with certainty that money was coined in the Asiatic colonies sooner than in the mother country. But when we call to mind the well known relation of Herodotus<sup>f</sup>, that the Lydians were the first who coined gold and silver, (a thing in itself not improbable, as it is known that

<sup>z</sup> EKHEL, *Doctrina Nummorum Veterum*, vol. i. p. 170—177. 242.

<sup>a</sup> PLUTARCH. *in Lycurg.* p. 177. His legislation is dated about 880 B. C.

<sup>b</sup> *Marmor Parium*. Ep. xxxi. cf. STRAB. viii. p. 563. This was about fifteen years before the legislation of Lycurgus. It might, therefore, not without probability, be supposed, that Lycurgus wished, and was able, to prohibit money of the precious metals, because it at that time was just beginning to circulate in Greece.

<sup>c</sup> See WACHTERI *Archæologia Nummaria*, Lips. 1740; and the introductory inquiries in EKHEL, *Doctrina Nummorum Veterum*.

<sup>d</sup> As, e. g. Cumæ.

<sup>e</sup> STRABO. viii. p. 577. He refers to Ephorus.

HEROD. i. 94.

Lydia abounded in gold<sup>a</sup>, and that the most flourishing Greek colonies were situated on the Lydian coast,) we cannot but think it highly probable, that the Greeks received this art, like so many other inventions, from Asia; and here too the remark again applies, that in their hands everything received a new form and a new beauty. For no nation has ever yet had coins of which the devices equalled in beauty those of the Grecian, and especially of the Sicilian cities.

The right of coining gold was regarded in Greece as the privilege of the state which superintended it. Hence arose that variety and multitude of coins which are easily distinguished by their peculiar stamp. Coins were also struck by several of the nations, the Thessalians, the Boeotians, and others, as they formed by their alliance one political body.

Though the Grecian coins were of both precious and base metals, they were originally struck of precious metal only, and probably at first of nothing but silver. So few gold coins have been preserved, that we cannot certainly say whether they are altogether as ancient; but those of base metal are certainly of a later period. That even before the time of Solon, silver money had in many cities a large proportion of alloy, appears from the passage which we cited from Demosthenes<sup>b</sup>. In Greece itself, we know of no silver mines except those of Laurium, which were very ancient<sup>c</sup>; but the gold mines of Thrace and the neighbouring island, Thasos, were quite as ancient, having been wrought by the Phœnicians. Yet the Greeks received most of their gold from Lydia. And still there was not specie enough in circulation, especially in the com-

<sup>a</sup> Nor is there any other nation which disputes this honour with the Lydians. For the Egyptians, &c. g. are named without any reason. See WACHTER, l. c. cap. iv.

<sup>b</sup> Yet the ancient gold coins which we still possess have hardly any alloy, and the silver ones very little.

<sup>c</sup> So ancient, that it was impossible to fix their age, XENOPH.*de Vectig.* p. 924.

mercial towns; and although the Greeks knew nothing of paper money, several cities had recourse to the same measure which had been introduced at Carthage<sup>k</sup>, the use of tokens, which passed current at a higher value than they possessed intrinsically<sup>l</sup>. Such was the iron money circulated in Byzantium, Clazomenæ<sup>m</sup>, and perhaps in some other cities<sup>n</sup>. It is certain, therefore, that the Greeks had money which was current only at home, and was of no value abroad; as we learn also from a passage in Plato<sup>o</sup>. It is much to be regretted that we do not know by what means its value was kept from falling.

The inquiry into the economy of a nation, intricate as it may be, can be reduced to the following points; What were the wants of the state? What means were adopted to supply them? How were those means procured? How administered? The inquiry respecting the economy of the Grecian states will be conducted with reference to these questions.

The small republics of that people appear at the first view, according to the modern criterion, to have had hardly any wants which could make a financial system necessary; and in fact there were some states, as Sparta, during a long period, without any finances. The magistrates were rewarded with honour, not with money. The soldiers were citizens and not mercenaries: and many of those public institutions, which

<sup>k</sup> HETREN'S *Historical Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Principal Nations of Antiquity. African Nations*, vol. i. p. 145. Oxford, 1832.

<sup>l</sup> POLLUX, ix. 78.

<sup>m</sup> ARISTOT. *Econ.* p. 383. A decisive passage.

<sup>n</sup> Most of the cities, says XENOPHON, p. 922, have money which is not current except in their own territory; hence merchants are obliged to barter their own wares for other wares. Athens makes a solitary exception. It was therefore quite common for cities to have two kinds of money, coins of nominal value current only in the city which struck them; and metallic money, of which the value depended on its intrinsic worth, and which circulated in other places. Hence PLATO de Legg. v. p. 742. permits this in his state.

<sup>o</sup> PLATO l. c. The current silver money was in drachmas, and pieces of money were struck of as much as four drachmas. EKHEL, vol. i. p. 85. thinks it probable that the other cities followed the Attic standard.

are now supported by government for the most various purposes, and sometimes at very great expense, were then entirely unknown, because they were not felt to be necessary.

Nevertheless we find the contrary to have been true. The burthens which the citizens of those republics had to support, continued gradually to increase; and, in the later period of Grecian liberty, became so great, that they were in fact oppressive. States can create wants, no less than individuals. Even in Greece, experience shows that necessities were multiplied with the increase of power and splendour. But when we call them oppressive, we must not forget that the burthen of the contributions paid to the state is not to be estimated by their absolute amount; nor yet by the proportion alone which that amount bears to the income. In our present investigations, it is more important to bear in mind a point which our modern economists have entirely overlooked, viz. that in republican states (or at least more especially in them) there exists, besides a mere calculation of the money levied from the community, a moral criterion, by which a judgment on the greater or less degree of oppression is to be formed. Where the citizen exists only with and for the state; where the preservation of the commonwealth is everything to the individual; many taxes are easily paid, which, under other circumstances, would have been highly oppressive. But in the theories of our modern politicians, there is no chapter which treats of the important influence of patriotism and public spirit on the financial system; probably because the statistical tables do not make mention of them as sources of produce.

The wants of states are partly established by necessary wants; but still more by opinion. That is a real want which is believed to be such. The explanation of the management of the affairs of any nation, would necessarily be very imperfect if we should pay no regard to the ideas which it entertained respecting its

necessities. On this point the Greeks had very different notions from ours. Many things seemed essential to them, which do not appear so to us; many things are needed by us, of which they did not feel the want.

The first object with the Greek was the honour and splendour of his city. In that world of small republics, each wished to make itself remarkable: each to be distinguished for something. Now there were two things which in the eyes of the Greeks rendered a city illustrious; its public monuments and its festivals. These objects were therefore politically necessary, in a different sense from that in which they can be so called in modern states. Among these the first place belongs to the temples. No Grecian city was without gods, some of whom it honoured as its guardian deities. How could these gods be left without dwelling-places? The art of sculpture was very naturally exerted in connection with that of architecture; for the statues of the gods did not merely adorn the temples, but were indispensably necessary as objects of adoration. The same may be said of the festivals. A life without holidays would have ceased to be life to a Greek. But these holidays were not passed exclusively in prayers, or at banquets. Processions, music, and public shows, were an essential part of them. These were not merely the diversions of the people during the festival, they constituted the festival itself.

All this was intimately connected with religion. The Greeks had scarcely any public festivals that were not religious. They were celebrated in honour of some god or hero; above all in honour of the tutelar deities of the place<sup>P</sup>. But this means, many things which we are accustomed to regard as objects of amusement, received a much more elevated character. They became duties enjoined by religion: which could

<sup>P</sup> MEUNSIUS *Gracia Feriata*, in GRONOV. *Thes. Ant. Græc.* vol. vii. is one of the best compilations on the subject of the Grecian festivals.

not be neglected without injury to the honour and reputation, and even to the welfare, of the city. The gods would have been incensed ; and the accidental evils which might have fallen on the city, would infallibly have been regarded as punishments inflicted by the gods. We need not, therefore, be astonished when we hear that a city could be very seriously embarrassed by the want of sufficient means to celebrate its festivals with due solemnity<sup>q</sup>.

Thus a field, almost boundless, was opened for public expenses, and these too of a kind hardly known to modern states. Even in cases where a government may think it necessary to expend something on public festivals, little is done except in the capital ; and this expense has never, to my knowledge, made an article in a budget. It would have made the very first in Grecian cities, at least in times of peace. And he who can form a clear idea of their political condition, will easily perceive how many things must have combined to increase these expenses. They were prompted not by a mere regard for the honour of the state ; jealousy and envy of the other cities had also their influence. Still more is to be attributed to the emulation and the vanity of those who were appointed to manage the money devoted to this purpose. One desired to surpass another. This was the most reputable manner of displaying wealth. And although, as far as we know, public shows were not in the Grecian cities so indispensable for gaining the favour of the people as at Rome (probably because what in Rome was originally voluntary, had ever been considered in Greece as one of the duties and burthens of a citizen, which did not deserve the thanks of his fellow-citizens) ; political ends often, perhaps, exercised a considerable influence on particular individuals.

The Grecian temples had, for the most part, pos-

<sup>q</sup> See what ARISTOTLE relates of the Antissaean (Antisthenes,) *Econ.* p. 390.

sessions of their own, which served to defray the expenses incurred in the service of the god. These possessions consisted partly in votive presents, which had been consecrated (especially where the divinities of health and prophecy were adored) by the hopes or the gratitude of the suppliants for advice and counsel. We know from several examples, especially from that of the temple of Delphi, that treasures were there accumulated, of more value, probably, than those of Loretto, or any other shrine in Europe<sup>1</sup>. But as they were sacred to the gods, and did not come into circulation, they were for the most part unproductive treasures, possessing no other value than that which they received from the artist. We could desire more accurate information respecting the administration of the treasures of the temples; for it seems hardly credible, that the great stores of unwrought gold and silver should have been left entirely unemployed. But besides these treasures, the temples drew a large part of their revenue from lands<sup>2</sup>; which were not unfrequently consecrated to their service. When a new colony was founded, it was usual to devote at once a part of its territory to the gods<sup>3</sup>. But although these resources were sufficient for the support of the temple, the priests, the various persons employed in the service of the temples, and perhaps the daily sacrifices; yet

The consequences of the profanation of the Delphic treasures in the sacred war, may be learned from ATHEN. vi. p. 231 sqq.

Not only single fields, but whole districts were consecrated to the gods. Beside the fields of Cirrha, the whole of Phocis was consecrated to Apollo of Delphi, DIOD. xvi. p. 99. Brasidas devoted to Minerva the territory of Lecythus, which he had conquered, THUCYD. iv. 116. It is a mistake to believe that the consecrated land necessarily remained uncultivated. That of Cirrha remained so, because a curse rested on it, PVSAN. p. 894. In other cases it was used sometimes for pasture land, especially for the sacred herds, THUCYD. v. 53, sometimes it was tilled, THUCYD. iii. 68; but for the most part let for rent. Whoever did not pay the rent (*μισθώσας τινες τερπεῖν*) became *arripios*, or deprived of all civil rights, DEMOSTH. in Macart. p. 1069. In another passage the orator complains of the number of enemies he had made by collecting these rents when he was demarch, On. in Eubulid. p. 1318. Two contracts for similar rents have been preserved, MAZOCCHI Tabb. Heraclensis, p. 145. 257 sqq.

<sup>1</sup> PLATO de Leg. iv. p. 717.

the incense and other expenses, the celebration of the festivals with all the costs connected with them, still continued a burthen to the public.

Beside the expenses which were required by religion and the honour of the city, there were others required by the administration. The magistrates, in the proper sense of the word, were without salaries; but the state needed many inferior servants for the collection of taxes, police, etc.; and these must certainly have been paid<sup>u</sup>. Add to this that several of the duties of citizens were of such a nature that it at last became necessary to pay for the performance of them, though it had not been done at an earlier period. To this class belongs the duty of attending the courts; and when we come to consider the constitution of Athens, we shall find that the number of those who were to be paid, caused this expense to be one of the heaviest.

But as the states increased in power, the greatest expenses were occasioned by the military and naval establishments. These were for the most part extraordinary; since the state in times of peace had no standing army and no sailors to pay. But even in times of peace large supplies were needed for the support of the magazines and ships; and, unfortunately for Greece, the general condition of the more powerful states came at last to be that of war rather than of peace. If wars under any circumstances are costly, two causes contributed to make them especially so in Greece. The first was the custom which arose of employing hired troops. As long as wars were carried on by the militia of the country, which required no pay, the costs of them were not very considerable; as every one served at his own expense. But when hired troops began to be used, everything was changed. We

<sup>u</sup> But though the magistrates were not paid, there were certain offices (especially such as were connected with the care of any funds) which were sometimes very productive to those who held them. An example of this kind is found in DEMOSTH. in *Mid.* p. 570.

shall take another opportunity of showing how this custom, by which the whole political condition of Greece was most deeply and incurably disordered, continued to gain ground from the first moment of its introduction. Hence arose the pecuniary embarrassment of so many Grecian cities during the Peloponnesian war. The second leading cause is to be found in the improvements of naval forces, and their increasing importance to the ruling states. The building, support, and fitting out of squadrons, which are always so expensive, must have been doubly so to the Greeks, who were obliged to import their timber and many other articles from a distance. The expense became still greater when the cities began to outbid each other in the pay of their sailors; which they did as soon as the Spartans were enabled, by the Persian supplies, to outbid their rivals<sup>x</sup>. Need we be astonished, then, at finding, under such circumstance, that the trierarchies, or contributions of the rich towards the fitting out of the galleys, were the most oppressive of all the public burthens<sup>y</sup>?

Different, therefore, as was the list of public expenses from that of modern states, we still find some points of agreement. We have now to inquire, What were the sources of the public revenue? What in particular was the system of taxation?

There is but one state in Greece, that of Athens, respecting which any accurate information on this subject has been preserved. It would be too hasty an inference to say, that what was usual in that city was usual in all others. But though the particular regulations may have been very different, a great general

<sup>x</sup> This is known to have been done during the Peloponnesian war, as well by the Corinthians, THUCYD. i. 31, as by Sparta, which state received of the Persians more than 5000 talents for that purpose, ISOCRAT. *de Pace*, p. 179.

<sup>y</sup> We do not find it mentioned, that the trierarchies, which were common at Athens, were usual in the other maritime cities; but the rich doubtless bore the burthen of fitting out the ships. See, respecting Corinth, THUCYD. l. c.

similarity must certainly have prevailed; and it is this which we are now to consider. Such a resemblance was a natural consequence of the preponderating power and political influence of Athens. In the states which were its allies, how much must necessarily have been regulated by its example? And the little information which we are able to collect respecting their revenues, appears to prove the fact beyond a doubt.

It is to Aristotle, once more, that we owe a general view of this subject<sup>a</sup>. After classifying the sources of revenue in monarchies, with respect to the general no less than the provincial administration<sup>a</sup>, he continues: "The third kind of administration is that of republics. In them, the principal source of revenue is from the produce of their own soil; the second from merchandise and the markets; the third from the contributions paid by the citizens in turn<sup>b</sup>." When we learn that these last were a sort of property tax for the richer class, and that the second could have been nothing but

<sup>a</sup> ARISTOT. *Econ.* ii. 1. This short treatise is a mere collection of examples, and therefore its date is of more importance than its author. That it probably belongs to the period of the Persian empire, and is at least not later than Aristotle or Alexander, is admitted even by Schneider, who in his edition questions its genuineness. Is it not however possible that Aristotle himself may have made collections of this kind, one of which may have been accidentally preserved? [Niebuhr has shown beyond a doubt that the second book of the *Economics* is not by Aristotle. See *Philological Museum*, part I. E.]

<sup>b</sup> Ἡ βασιλικὴ and η σαραπικὴ. When the Greeks spoke of an empire, they always had in mind the empire of Persia.

Τοῖτον ἐε τὴν πολιτικήν. ταῦτης ἐε κρατίστη μὲν πρόσωδος η ἀπὸ τῶν ιείων ἐν τῷ χώρᾳ γιγνομένων, εἴτα ἀπὸ ἐμπορίων καὶ δι' ἀγώνων, εἴτα η ἀπὸ τῶν ἔγκυδιων. It is known from the orators, that these last are the burthens borne in turn by the rich, *λειτουργίαι*, DEMOSTH. in *Lepatin*, p. 463. If the words δι' ἀγώνων are correct, the public games and assemblies are intended, with which fairs were commonly connected; otherwise it would be natural to conjecture ἀγοραῖων instead of ἀγώνων. The sense remains the same. [For δι' ἀγώνων, the right reading (as Boeckh has remarked) is διαγωγῶν, which Bekker has received into the text in his late edition of Aristotle's works, vol. ii. p. 1346. The revenue ἀπὸ ἐμπορίων καὶ διαγωγῶν, consists therefore of harbour-dues and transit-duties. The meaning of the expression ἀπὸ τῶν ἔγκυδιων is doubtful, but probably it has no reference to the λειτουργίαι: Boeckh translates it "from the ordinary or common things;" i. e. probably certain customary payments and fees (including fines, forfeitures, etc.), which did not fall under the two first heads. See BOECKH'S *Public Economy of Athens*, vol. ii. p. 7. English transl. E.]

duties on articles of consumption, we perceive at once what we are soon to prove, that in the Grecian states, our direct and indirect taxes were established, though, in technical language, the distinction was differently made. This subject deserves to be treated with closer attention.

In the economy of modern states, the taxes on lands and houses are considered the most important of all direct taxes. Now with both these the Greeks certainly were acquainted. "In Menda," says Aristotle, "the common expenses of the administration are paid from the revenue derived from the harbours and other duties; while the taxes on land and houses were regularly *assessed*; but they were only *collected* when extraordinary supplies were required<sup>c</sup>." This example shows very clearly, that the Greeks knew practically the difference between direct and indirect taxes; but it still remains doubtful, whether the tax on the soil was a land-tax in the modern sense, levied according to its area and quality; or whether it was a tax on the raw produce. The first is not probable. We hear nothing of a register of landed estates in Greece; though there was one in the great empire of Persia, at least in certain provinces<sup>d</sup>. It is more probable that a portion of the produce of the soil was taken, and commonly a tithe, as Aristotle expressly mentions, of fruits and of cattle<sup>e</sup>. In what degree these taxes were usual in the Grecian cities is nowhere expressly related; nor do we know whether they were levied on certain estates, or on all lands. That they were very common is hardly to be doubted, since the remark of Aristotle is general.

Poll taxes were less frequently levied on the citizens

<sup>c</sup> ARISTOT. *Econ.* ii. 2. 21. Menda was a Grecian city on the coast of Macedonia, not far from Potidæa.

<sup>d</sup> HEEREN'S *Historical Researches into the Politics, Intercourse, and Trade of the Principal Nations of Antiquity. Asiatic Nations*, vol. i. *Persians*, p. 408 and 423. Oxford, 1832.

<sup>e</sup> *Econ.* ii. 1. 3.

than on the resident aliens (*μέτοικοι*). These formed in most of the Grecian cities a numerous class of inhabitants, and were obliged to pay for protection a sum<sup>f</sup> which was sometimes a poll tax, and sometimes a tax on property. We know with certainty that such duties were paid by the foreigners at Athens.

However much the invention of the practical politician may be excited by increasing expenses, the character of the state settles, in a certain measure, the kinds of taxes. Where a community imposes its own taxes, the direct taxes, and among them those on property, will have the first rank. That each citizen, or rather, that the richer citizens (for the rule does not, of course, apply to the poorer classes) should share in the public burthens in proportion to their means, is so natural an idea, that it cannot but occur to every one. But in considering the taxes on property as forming the chief division, we must first offer two preliminary observations.

First: The taxes on property were not so regular as to be paid from year to year according to the same fixed standard. The necessary sums were only voted as circumstances required; and then collected with great rigour. Of this we have many examples in Demosthenes and others<sup>g</sup>. In times of peace, whole years might pass away in which no such taxes were required to be paid; while in others they increased so much, that Isocrates said that it was almost better to be a poor than a rich man; the poor not being exposed to them<sup>h</sup>.

Secondly: There were certain kinds of expenses which were not estimated at a fixed amount, but were too considerable to be borne by any but the opulent;

<sup>f</sup> Τὸ μετοίκιον. The regulations respecting this and its amount may be found in Harpocration, in v.

<sup>g</sup> They were called in Athens *εισφοραι*. According to BOECKH, *Economy of Athens*, vol. ii. p. 228. they were not collected at Athens, at least under that name, before the Peloponnesian war. No one will doubt that they were customary in other cities, though under different names.

<sup>h</sup> ISOCRAT, *de Pace*, p. 185.

we mean those offices which each citizen was obliged to perform in his turn, and at his own cost (*λειτουργίαι*)<sup>i</sup>. To this class belonged partly the charge of the public festivals and shows, banquets, and bands of music connected with them: and partly, at least at Athens, and probably in other maritime towns, the fitting out of the galleys. The first class of these expenses was from its nature permanent; and the same was nearly the case with the other. They were borne by the citizens in rotation; those who were free one year being obliged to defray them the next. But these imposts, especially the first, were the more oppressive from the circumstance of their not being fixed at any certain amount; but depended, not merely on the wants of the state, but the pride of him who supplied them.

Taxes on property are attended with one great difficulty, that they cannot be duly apportioned without a knowledge of the means of each contributor. But they depend also, in a great measure, on the honesty and public spirit of the citizens. Where these exist (and they can nowhere prevail to a greater extent than in such communities as the Grecian states) there is no need of returns on the part of those who are to be taxed, nor of any inquisition on the part of the state. Confidence is reposed in the honour of the contributor; and instances may be found of states in which even a suspicion of any insincerity was almost unheard of<sup>k</sup>. In the Greek cities, at least in Athens, very severe measures were in the later periods made use of against those who were suspected of concealing the true state of their possessions, or whom it was desired to vex in that manner. They could be compelled to exchange their

<sup>i</sup> In the widest sense, comprehending not only the fitting out of the ships (*τριηραρχίαι*), but also the charge of the chorus (*χορηγίαι*) and the gymnastic games (*γυμνασιαρχίαι*).

<sup>k</sup> As in several of the German imperial towns. The author is acquainted with one in which the contributions were thrown into a box, unexamined; and yet the amount of the whole was previously known with almost perfect exactness.

property for the sum at which they had estimated it<sup>l</sup>. But in better times such measures, though perhaps permitted, seem never to have been usual. A division was made into classes according to the amount of income; such as had been established at Athens by the regulations of Solon. These classes presupposed an estimate of property<sup>m</sup>; but whether this was made in the Grecian cities as accurately as the census of the Romans, is a question which we must leave undecided<sup>n</sup>.

The indirect taxes (by which we mean the duties paid on the importation and exportation of commodities, as also on their consumption) were probably as common in the Grecian cities as those above mentioned. The instance of Menda which we have already cited, shows that they were, in some instances at least, preferred to the direct taxes. The commodities on which they were levied, and manner of collecting them, were in a great measure determined by the situation and peculiar employment of the cities. Custom duties were naturally a much more productive source of revenue to the maritime and commercial towns, than to the cities of the interior. But where these taxes were introduced, they were a constant source of income; while the taxes on property were each time imposed anew. From this it naturally resulted, that the former were chiefly destined to meet the current expenses.

Our knowledge of the Greek system of custom duties is very imperfect: yet we cannot doubt that such duties were almost universally levied. But they were most probably limited to the seaports and harbours, in

<sup>l</sup> The ἀντιδόσεις. See on this subject the speech of ISOCRATES, p. 312 sqq.

<sup>m</sup> τίμημα, DEMOSTH. in *Aphob.* i. p. 3 sqq.

<sup>n</sup> In some of the cities great accuracy seems to have prevailed in this valuation. Thus in Chios all private debts were entered in a public book, that it might be known what money was lent out, ARISTOT. *Oeon.* ii. 2. 5. In the Athenian colony Potidaea, in time of war, when money was wanting, every citizen was obliged to specify his property with exactness, and the contributions (*εισφοραι*) were apportioned out accordingly. He who possessed no property, κτῆμα οὐδὲν, paid a poll tax; his person being reckoned as two minas (about eight pounds), he paid the tax due on such a sum, ARISTOT. l. c.

connection with which they are almost always mentioned<sup>o</sup>; I know of no instance of customs in the interior. They were, according to Aristotle, levied on imported and exported articles<sup>p</sup>. At Athens, the custom duties are frequently mentioned by the orators; in Thessaly they formed the chief source of revenue<sup>q</sup>; and they were not of less importance in Macedonia<sup>r</sup>. When the Athenians became masters of the Ægean sea, they appropriated to themselves, in all subject islands, the collection of the custom duties instead of the tribute which had before been exacted<sup>s</sup>. The same was done with the very productive duties of Byzantium, which were paid by all ships trading to the Black sea<sup>t</sup>, in the same manner as dues are now levied on merchant vessels at the Sound. This comparison is the more just, as the duties of Byzantium, no less than those in the Sound, have been the occasion of a war<sup>u</sup>.

These instances, the number of which could easily be increased, are quite sufficient to prove that duties were very generally levied in the seaports. The principle on which the customs were regulated was adopted solely with a view to the increase of the public revenue; they were in no case intended for the encouragement and direction of domestic industry. But the rates seem to have been very different in the several cities, and for the different articles of merchandise. At Byzantium the duty was ten per cent. of the value of the commodities<sup>x</sup>. The Athenians, on the contrary, when they imposed duties in the harbours of their allies

<sup>o</sup> Hence the phrase *ληπίνας καρποῦσθαι*, to collect the custom duties in the harbours, DEMOSTH. i. 15.

<sup>p</sup> ARISTOT. l. c. τὰ εἰσαγώγμα καὶ τὰ ἐξαγώγμα.

<sup>q</sup> DEMOSTH. l. c.

<sup>r</sup> They were commonly farmed out in that country for twenty talents; which sum Callistratus succeeded in doubling, ARISTOT. Econ. ii. 2. 22.

<sup>s</sup> THUCYD. iv. 28.

<sup>t</sup> DEMOSTH. p. 475.

<sup>u</sup> Viz. between Byzantium and Rhodes, in 222 B. C.

<sup>x</sup> DEMOSTH. p. 475.

during the Peloponnesian war, required only five per cent<sup>y</sup>. In Athens itself there were, at least in the time of Demosthenes, several articles which paid a duty of only two per cent<sup>z</sup>. Among these were foreign corn<sup>a</sup>, and several other articles, such as fine woollen garments and vessels of silver<sup>b</sup>.

In the modern system of finance a distinction is made between duties on imports and exports, and taxes on domestic consumption<sup>c</sup>. Doubtless this was also the case in Greece; but in the Grecian cities, as in Rome, and perhaps in the whole of the ancient world, these taxes were imposed in one very simple form. Whatever was offered in the markets for sale paid a duty; and hence this duty is mentioned only with reference to the markets<sup>d</sup>. And I find no proof that taxes on consumption were adopted in any ancient state to the same extent as they have been in several modern nations<sup>e</sup>.

Beside the taxes already enumerated, there were others on various articles of luxury. Thus at Ephesus, a tax was paid for wearing gold on the clothes; and in Lycia for wearing false hair<sup>f</sup>. Examples are preserved by Aristotle, where, in cases of necessity, single cities adopted various extraordinary measures, such as the sale of the public estates<sup>g</sup>, the sale of the rights of citizenship, taxes on several professions and employments<sup>h</sup>,

<sup>y</sup> THUCYD. viii. 28.

<sup>z</sup> This is the πεντηκοστολόγος ἀπογραφὴ, DEMOSTH. in *Mid.* p. 558.

<sup>a</sup> DEMOSTH. in *Near.* p. 1353.

<sup>b</sup> DEMOSTH. in *Mid.* p. 568. enumerates several.

<sup>c</sup> Such as excise duties, licenses, etc.

<sup>d</sup> ARISTOT. p. 388. η ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ γῆν τε καὶ ἀγοραῖων τελῶν πρόσοδος. Hence the expression, τὰς ἀγοράς καρποῦσθαι, to collect the revenue in the markets, DEMOSTH. *Olynth.* i. p. 15.

<sup>e</sup> In Babylon there existed an antiquated law which was renewed by the governor appointed by Alexander, and which required that a tithe should be paid of everything brought into the city, ARISTOT. *Econ.* ii. 2, 34.

<sup>f</sup> ARISTOT. *Econ.* ii. 2, 14.

<sup>g</sup> ARISTOT. *Econ.* ii. 2, 3.

<sup>h</sup> A general income tax of ten per cent. on all employments was imposed by king Tachos in Egypt, at the instance of Chabrias, ARISTOT. I. c. p. 394. Though executed in Egypt, the idea was that of a Greek; and Pitt must resign his claim to the invention of the income tax.

as of conjurers and quacks, and monopolies, of which the state possessed itself for a season.

In all the Grecian cities, it is probable that the indirect taxes, especially the duties, were farmed. The custom of farming the revenue prevailed very generally in several of the monarchical states of antiquity; but in the Greek republics it seems to have been restricted to the indirect taxes. At Athens all the duties were farmed out; and the same was the case at Byzantium, in Macedonia, and in other places<sup>i</sup>. Demosthenes distinguishes three classes of persons who were interested in this transaction; those who rented the revenue; their sureties; and the inspectors and receivers<sup>k</sup>. It would be superfluous to speak of the great evils of this arrangement: but has it not been preserved by much larger states in modern Europe?

One important question still remains: Who, in the Grecian cities, had the right of fixing the taxes? The political science of the moderns has regarded it as one of the most important points, as the peculiar characteristic of a free constitution, that the government should not be permitted to impose taxes without the consent of the people, given either directly or by consent of its representatives. In most of the ancient republics the same custom probably prevailed; yet it is remarkable that no particular value was ever set upon this privilege; and still less was it ever considered a criterion of political liberty. The whole system of taxation, as we have already remarked, cannot be viewed in the light in which it is now taken; except under a representative system. But properly speaking, the whole subject was considered by the Greeks in a different point of view. Their magistrates were bound to acknowledge the obligation of laying their accounts before the people.

<sup>i</sup> See the passages cited above, which prove this.

<sup>k</sup> DEMOSTH. p. 745. *τέλος τι πουίμενος, η ἐγγυησάμενος, η ἐκλέγων.* Those who rented the taxes of the state were of course obliged to procure good sureties.

This was the characteristic of freedom<sup>1</sup>. Where this right is preserved by the people, it is of much less importance by whom the taxes are imposed.

But this question hardly admits of a general answer with respect to the Grecian cities. It cannot be doubted that the difference of constitutions required the legislation in financial matters to be lodged in various bodies; and though, from the want of documents, this is only a conjecture, it is certain that the difference of the taxes themselves must have produced such a variety.

The regular and permanent taxes were fixed by laws; some of which are expressly called ancient laws<sup>m</sup>. The sum allotted in Athens for the annual expense of the public sacrifices, was fixed by the laws of Solon at six talents<sup>n</sup>. For this purpose no farther grant was needed. The rates of the duties and taxes on consumption were in like manner established laws, which as their very name indicates<sup>o</sup>, were doubtless confirmed by the people; who of course had the right of making alterations in them. Those public charges which were borne in turn, viz. the trierarchies and the provision of the Chorus, were also established by ancient laws<sup>p</sup>; although these offices, especially the first, were, from their very nature, much influenced by the circumstances of the times; and hence they underwent greater and more frequent changes than any other imposts. That these regulations and their changes could not be made without the consent of the people, will be evident to every one who knows that that which the Greeks called a law (*νόμος*) could not in a republic proceed from any other source.

But what were the regulations respecting those extraordinary imposts, which were hardly less than per-

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 149.

<sup>m</sup> DEMOSTH. p. 462.

<sup>n</sup> See LYSIAS in Nicomach. p. 856. ed. Reisk.

<sup>o</sup> Νόμοι τελωνικοί, DEMOSTH. p. 732.

<sup>p</sup> DEMOSTH. p. 462.

manent, those taxes on property, known by the name of *εισφοραι*? That these should have been fixed exclusively by the people seems so natural in states where the highest authority is possessed by a popular assembly, that it may be thought superfluous to suggest this question. Yet we know that it was not so at Rome; where the taxes were appointed, not by the people, but by the senate. But at Athens, as we may learn from any of the political speeches of Demosthenes, the taxes were always confirmed by the people. It would be too hasty to infer from Athens that the same was true of all the other Grecian states. But wherever the financial regulations of the other states are mentioned (unless they were in subjection to a tyrant<sup>q</sup>), the expressions made use of always authorize the conclusion, that the consent of the people, or the assembly of the citizens, was necessary<sup>r</sup>.

A still greater variety seems to have prevailed in the administration of the public revenue, not only in the several states, but also at different periods in the same state. Those places and offices which were connected with that administration were naturally the objects of the greatest competition; and this alone would be sufficient to explain the changes which were made. But must not the difference of the constitutions have exercised its influence? In states where certain rich and noble families had obtained the ascendancy, it was natural that they should have the management of the

<sup>q</sup> Where tyrants had possessed themselves of the government, they imposed taxes at their own pleasure, as they were not ὑπεύθυνοι; they also adopted various artifices to increase their revenue, such as debasing the coin, etc. of which ARISTOT. *Econ.* lib. ii. has preserved various examples. But where they desired to preserve an appearance of decency, as Dionysius I. at Syracuse, this matter was laid before the ἐκληγία. ARISTOT. l. c. [A Greek tyrant imposed taxes at his pleasure, not because he was ἀνυπεύθυνος, but because the entire legislative power was vested in his person. No person could be ὑπεύθυνος for a legislative act: the ἀθέτην or investigation could only take place when a person had filled some executive office: see the Editor's note above, p. 138. E.]

<sup>r</sup> In the examples which Aristotle cites of Clazomenæ, Potidæa, and other places, his phrase is ἐψηφίσαντο, or νόμον ἐθέντο, which, as is well known, can only be understood of decrees of the people.

public money. In the two chief states of Greece, the most remarkable difference is perceptible. At Athens, the council of five hundred had the principal direction of the public money ; in Sparta, this belonged to the ephors. A great difference may therefore be supposed to have prevailed in the other Grecian cities with regard to the financial administration. The same may also be said with respect to the offices of collectors and accountants. But we have scarcely any information on this subject for any state except Athens.

Of all forms of government, those of free cities are perhaps the least adapted for the development of an artificial system of finance. In such states the wants, and the means of satisfying those wants, are commonly very simple. Changes are difficult ; for they imply the consent of the community\*. They who propose them can hardly expect thanks ; but must be prepared for hatred, or even persecution. Hence ancient usage is most strictly preserved ; and when extraordinary wants occur, recourse is had to extraordinary measures, concerted for the exigency of the moment, rather than to any change in the existing institutions. It is different in extensive monarchies, where everything is conducted with greater firmness and regularity ; and though they are guided by certain empirical maxims, rather than by scientific principles, yet it is to them that we are to look for the establishment of an artificial system of finance.

\* [It is by no means true, as is here stated, that the necessity of obtaining the consent of a large popular assembly increases the difficulty of making changes in laws. The history of Athens is a sufficient proof how easily laws are changed in a democracy, at least in a democracy constituted like the Athenian government. E.]

## CHAPTER XI.

### THE JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS.

UNLIKE the regulations of modern states, the judicial department did not form in Greece a separate branch of the government. On the contrary, it was so intimately connected with the rest, that it can with difficulty be made a separate object of investigation. There is hardly any subject in Grecian antiquities so intricate, or difficult of explanation; and yet without a knowledge of it, no correct view of the ancient states can be formed. Our present object is to develop the general character of the judicial institutions, without entering into particulars respecting the organization of the Athenian courts. All that we have to say upon this subject will find a place in our inquiries concerning that state.

The want of accounts is the chief, though not the only, source of the difficulty which attends this investigation with respect to every state except Athens. From the want of uniformity, as well as the singular character of many of the regulations, it would be difficult to take a general survey of the subject, even if the historical information were abundant. To gain a correct view of it, some attention must be paid to its history.

The judicial institutions of the Greeks were the creatures of time and circumstances. It will be impossible, therefore, for us to give a systematic account of institutions which were not systematically formed. We must on many points be content with saying that such

was the case ; without being able to give any satisfactory reasons why it was so.

The judicial institutions of a nation proceed from very simple beginnings. Where they are left to be developed by circumstances and the necessities of the times, they naturally become more and more intricate ; since with the progress of civilization new relations arise, both at home and with foreign countries. In the heroic age, kings sat on the tribunal of justice, though even then arbitrators were not unusual<sup>a</sup>. There existed at that time no written laws ; questions were decided by prescription and common sense, directed by a love of justice.

When nations begin to emerge from the rude state of savages, the first necessity which is felt is that of *personal security*, and next the security of *property*. Legislation has always begun with the criminal code ; the civil law arises more slowly, and at a later period, because it had not before been necessary. The most ancient courts of justice were established very early, probably in the times of the kings. Their immediate object was to pass judgment on the crime of murder and other heinous offences. This was the case with the Areopagus, the most ancient court with which the Greeks were acquainted ; and there were others of almost as early a date.

The regal governments passed away ; and the popular assemblies took their place. The existing courts of justice were not however abolished ; although in the progress of time, and amidst the revolutions in the forms of government, they underwent various modifications.

In the states of modern Europe, the form of the judicial institutions depended in a great measure on the feudal system. In this there were different degrees of fealty and vassalage ; and hence arose the

<sup>a</sup> See above, p. 78.

principle, that every man must be tried by his peers. Thus a difference in the courts of justice was necessarily produced. The immediate vassal of the crown recognised only those for his judges who stood in the same rank with himself, and owed allegiance to the same lord. The freeman and the villein could not stand before the same tribunal.

The principle, that a man must be tried by his peers, also prevailed among the Greeks. But its application produced very different results. The community consisted of citizens, who either were or claimed to be equal. It decided all affairs relating to itself, and hence actions at law among the rest. Thus the public assembly performed the office of judge ; and the foundation of the popular courts of justice was laid. A notion then prevailed (which never has been adopted in our modern constitutions) that it was essential for a citizen to take part in the administration of justice. Even in those of our modern states, which in so many things resemble the Grecian, viz. the German imperial cities, this idea could never have either occurred or been put in practice. They had adopted the laws of an ancient nation, written in an ancient language ; and to understand them, a degree of learning was required, of which few could be possessed. It was not so in Greece. The laws were in the language of the country ; and, although their number gradually increased, they were still accessible to all. Neither was it necessary to retain them in the memory, and have them always present to the mind. The orator, during his speech, had a reader at his side with a copy of them. Whenever he referred to any law, it was read aloud ; as is proved by a multitude of examples in Demosthenes and others. Everything was, however, transacted orally. The judges were not obliged to peruse written documents ; they listened, and gave their votes.

All this appears very simple, and easy to be under-

stood. And yet the judicial institutions of Greece, if we should form our opinion from Athens, the state with which we are best acquainted, were so intricate, that it is difficult for the most learned antiquarians to find their way through the labyrinth.

The first and most important difficulty is presented when we attempt to fix the characteristic difference between the public and private courts. This difference was not only general in the existing states, but was adopted by Plato himself in his sketch of a perfect colony<sup>b</sup>. These two classes were so distinctly separated, that different expressions were appropriated, not only for the general, but even the particular relations of the one and the other<sup>c</sup>.

The principles on which Plato made this division are as follows. "One class of judicial suits," says he<sup>d</sup>, "is formed of the actions which one private man, complaining of injustice, brings against another. The second class is, when the state is injured by one of the citizens, or when a citizen comes forward to its assistance." According to this explanation, nothing would seem simpler than the difference between public and private lawsuits. But if we compare the subjects comprehended under each of the two classes, we shall find many things enumerated as public which to us do not seem to affect the state<sup>e</sup>. For this two reasons may be assigned.

The first is the view which the Greeks entertained of the relation of the individual citizen to the state.

<sup>b</sup> PLATO. *de Leg.* lib. 6. vol. iv. p. 282.

<sup>c</sup> A public accusation was called *γραφή* and *κατηγορία*, to accuse any one *διώκειν*, to be accused *φεύγειν τὴν γραφήν*. A private suit was called *δίκη*, to bring an action *εἰσάγειν* and *εἰσφέρειν τινὶ δίκην*, to be defendant *διφείλειν τινὶ δίκην*. Such were the expressions at least in Athens. Whenever the words *γραφή* and *δίκη* are used in a wider sense, this is not their technical acceptation.

<sup>d</sup> PLATO. l. c.

<sup>e</sup> At Athens, e. g. there belonged to this class, besides several other offences, murder, intentional wounds, adultery, etc. The public and private lawsuits are enumerated in SIGONIUS *de Repub. Athen.* l. iii. and may be found also in POTTER's *Antiquities*. See also OTTO *De Atheniensium actionibus Forensibus*. Lipsiæ, 1820.

The person of the citizen was highly valued; and in proportion to the importance of the rights of citizenship. An injury done to a private citizen was, therefore, in some measure, an injury inflicted on the state; and thus almost every injustice suffered by the individual was a public concern. Yet a difference existed according to the degree of the injury; nor was it indifferent whether the rights of persons or only those of property had been violated.

A second circumstance also had its influence; custom for the most part determined what was a crime against the public, and what was but a private concern. But that which had once been established as a custom was ever after valid as a law. Yet who can discover all the causes, perhaps frequently accidental, by which various suits came to be considered at different times as affairs of the public?

It would be useless to attempt to draw very accurately the line of division according to the subjects. The most numerous and the most important, though not all, criminal cases were regarded as public concerns. This class embraced not merely offences against the state; though they were considered virtually as such. We must rather be content with saying, that prescription had caused certain offences to be regarded as public, and others as private matters. The regulations respecting them in the Athenian law were, however, very exact; and it was clearly laid down, which suits belonged to the state, and which to individuals.

The character of the two classes may be essentially distinguished thus; that in the public lawsuits, a complaint might be made by any citizen; and in the private, it could be made only by the injured person, or his nearest relations<sup>f</sup>; for in the one case, the state, or the whole community, was regarded as the injured party; in the other, only the individual.

<sup>f</sup> See the proofs in SIGONIUS, l. c.

But whoever brought the suit, it was necessary in private and public concerns for the complainant to enter his complaint before a magistrate, and plainly to state the offence which he charged against the accused. The magistrate, before whom the suit was thus commenced, was then obliged to prepare the case, so that it could be submitted to the judges. These judges were either the whole community, or particular courts chosen from the people. For the tribunals consisted for the most part of very numerous assemblies, the members of which were selected from the citizens by lot, and were required to be thirty years of age, of a good reputation, and to owe nothing to the state. They were sworn to do their duty; they listened to the pleaders, both the accusers and the defendants, to whom a limited time was allowed; the witnesses were examined, and the affair so far brought to a close, that the court could pronounce its sentence of guilty or not guilty<sup>g</sup>. In the first case, the nature of the punishment remained to be settled. Where this was fixed by law, sentence was immediately passed; if the nature of the offence rendered that impossible, the defendant was permitted to estimate the punishment of which he thought himself worthy; and the court then decided.

These courts were therefore similar both in their organization and design to our juries; with this difference, that whereas our juries are only twelve in number, the others were not unfrequently composed of several hundreds. And this is not astonishing, for they stood in the place of the whole community; for when suits began to grow frequent, the whole people could not always be assembled. But when the members that constituted the tribunal were as numerous as at the Heliæa at Athens, it is scarcely possible that every

<sup>g</sup> This was done in Athens partly by votes written on small tablets, and partly by white and black beans.

at Sparta, but all lawsuits were there, as at Carthage, decided by magistrates<sup>k</sup>. If Sparta had had such courts, would they not have been mentioned? But when Aristotle says in general, that it is the chief characteristic of a democracy that all the citizens should judge in all cases<sup>l</sup>, may we not infer, and is it not evident, that popular tribunals never existed under an oligarchy?

The instance of Athens shows in a remarkable manner, how the institution of these popular tribunals could affect the whole character of a state. Such could be the case at Athens, where the greatest encouragement was given to the public trials, by permitting any persons who desired, to appear as accusers. The whole organization of the city-governments of Greece leads us to believe that most of the other cities had popular tribunals, which, without having exactly the same form, must have been similar to those of Athens. Such tribunals must have existed at Argos before the introduction of ostracism, and at Syracuse before the similar method of banishment by petalism was established. But whether the public lawsuits anywhere embraced as many subjects as at Athens, and as many things, which to us seem to regard the private citizen alone, is a question which we cannot decide.

This point has been entirely overlooked by those who have written on the judicial institutions of Greece; for they had Athens only in view, and treated the subject more as one of jurisprudence than of general history. And yet it is of all the most important. The

<sup>k</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* ii. 11, καὶ τὰς ἕικας ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχείων ἕικαζοθαν πάσας, καὶ μὴ ἄλλας ὑπ' ἄλλων, ὥσπερ ἐν Λακεδαιμονίῳ. Is ἕικας in this passage to be understood of all lawsuits, or, according to the strict use of the word, only of private suits?

<sup>l</sup> ARISTOT. *Polit.* vi. 2. τὸ δικάζειν πάντας καὶ ἐκ πάντων καὶ περὶ πάντων, η περὶ τῶν πλειστῶν καὶ τῶν μεγίστων καὶ τῶν κυριωτάτων, οἷον περὶ εὐθυνῶν καὶ πολιτείας καὶ τῶν ἔτον συναλλαγμάτων.

more limited was the number of public suits, the less possibility was there of instituting them, unless some personal injury had been sustained. In the list of public offences at Athens, there were many which by their very nature were indefinite. Hence it was easy to bring a public action against almost any one. We need but think of an age of corruption, to understand how Athens, after the Peloponnesian war, could swarm with sycophants, against whom the orators are so loud in their complaints; and whom all the measures adopted in consequence of the magnitude of the evil, all the danger and punishments to which false accusers were exposed, were never sufficient to restrain.

But were the other, or at least the democratic, states in as bad a condition as Athens? Here we are deserted by history; which has preserved little information on the subject of judicature. But though at Athens several accidental causes, partly arising from the national character, and partly from the political power of that city, (for the importance of state-trials increases with the importance of the state,) contributed to multiply this class of lawsuits; it by no means follows that the number was much smaller in most of the other Grecian cities. Popular tribunals are the sources of political revolutions; and what states abounded in them more than the Grecian? The man of influence, always an object of envy, was the most exposed to accusations, where it was so easy to find a ground of accusation; but the man of influence had also the greatest resources without the precincts of the court. Supported by his party, if conscious of possessing sufficient strength, he would have recourse to arms, and instead of suffering himself to be banished from the city, prefer to terminate the suit by driving away his enemies. Were we more intimately acquainted with the history of the numberless political revolutions in Greece, how

often would this same succession of events recur? But though we are not always able to establish them by historical evidence, they cannot on the whole be doubted; and they distinctly exhibit the close connection which existed between the ancient states and their judicial institutions.

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE ARMY AND NAVY.

NOTWITHSTANDING the frequency of wars in Greece, the art of war did not make any considerable advances. The civil and other institutions opposed too many obstacles; and war never became a regular science till standing armies were introduced. There were some individual commanders of great merit, who did all that talents could do; but what they effected was merely personal. Besides, the extent of states sets limits to improvement. These bounds cannot be accurately marked, where genius and circumstances exercise so much influence; but absolute strength must also necessarily be considered. The advancement and perfection of the art of war require experiments on so large a scale, that small states cannot perform them.

After the republican constitutions of the Greeks were established, their armies consisted chiefly of citizens. Every citizen was obliged to serve, unless the state made particular exceptions. In Athens, the obligation to serve continued from the eighteenth to the fifty-eighth year; we do not know whether it was elsewhere the same; but a great difference could hardly have existed. Every citizen was therefore a soldier; even the resident aliens were not always spared<sup>a</sup>; and there were times of distress when the very slaves were

<sup>a</sup> They were at least obliged to serve in the navy. DEMOSTH. *Phil.* p. 50.

armed, usually on a promise of manumission if they should do their duty<sup>b</sup>.

The militia of a country may, under certain circumstances, very nearly resemble a standing army. Yet the principles on which the two are founded are very different. The citizen who serves as a soldier, has for his object the defence of his family and his property; and hence the maxim in states where the army is composed of citizens, that he who has the most to lose will make the best soldier. In Rome the poorer class (*capite censi*), till the time of Marius, was excluded from military service; and it seems to have been nearly the same at Athens<sup>c</sup>. Yet this poorer class was, or grew to be, the most numerous; accustomed to privations, those who composed it were perhaps for that reason the best fitted for the duties of war. But when standing armies are maintained, property ceases to be regarded; and most of the enlistments are made from the needy part of the community. What a contrast between this and the Grecian institutions!

Considering, therefore, the small size of the Grecian states, it was the less to be expected that any of them could assemble a large army, if the slaves were not armed. Even where every one was put in motion, the number remained limited; not more than ten thousand Athenians fought on the plain of Marathon. Large armies could be collected only by the union of many states; the most numerous ever assembled in Greece during its independence, was engaged in the battle of Platææ<sup>d</sup>. But these extensive alliances were commonly of a temporary nature; and on that account the art of war could not be much advanced by them. From the battle of Platææ till the age of Epaminondas, that

<sup>b</sup> THUCYD. iv. 5.

<sup>c</sup> HARPOCRATES in Οἰντρεց. Yet it is evident from this passage, that the case was different in the time of Demosthenes.

<sup>d</sup> About 111,000 men. But only 38,000 were heavily armed; and of the light armed troops, 37,000 were Spartan Helots, HERON, ix. 29, 30.

is, during the most flourishing period of Greece, a Grecian army of thirty thousand men was probably never assembled in one place.

The Persian war seems to have been better adapted to the improvement of military science. But after the battle of Plataæ, it was the navy and not the land forces which became of decisive influence. After that battle, no other of importance was fought by land; no large Grecian army was again brought into the field. By maintaining the ascendancy in the *Aegean* sea, Greece was protected.

The petty wars which, after the victories over the Persians, were carried on between the several states, could not contribute much to the advancement of the art. They consisted only of single expeditions, and were decided by single insignificant engagements.

No considerable improvement could therefore be expected till the time of the Peloponnesian war, in which all Greece was involved. But this war soon came to be carried on more by sea than by land; and the military operations consisted principally in sieges. No great battle was fought on land during its whole course; besides naval science, therefore, the art of besieging perhaps made some progress, especially in the expedition against Syracuse. But as this expedition terminated in the total destruction of the army, it could have no permanent effects.

Until the age of Epaminondas, Sparta and Athens are the only states which attract our attention. In Sparta, where the militia resembled a standing army, it would seem that the art of war might have made some advances. But two causes prevented it. The one was the obstinate attachment to ancient usage, which rendered changes and improvements difficult. The other was the remarkable scarcity of great commanders, a scarcity which could little have been expected in a warlike state; but which may have proceeded from the first of the two causes we have assigned. If we

possessed a history of Pausanias written by himself, it would perhaps show us how his talents, limited in their exercise by the regulations of his native city, proved ruinous to himself, as in the case of the German Wallenstein, by making him a traitor. Leonidas has our admiration for his greatness as a man, not as a general; and the impetuous Brasidas, well fitted to be the hero of a revolutionary war, like the Peloponnesian, fell in the very beginning of his career<sup>e</sup>, and no worthy successors appeared till Lysander and Agesilaus. And of the first of these two, it is known that he placed more reliance in the Persian subsidies than in his own resources.

More might then have been expected from Athens. But in that state, as our preceding remarks have made apparent, the army was subordinate to the navy. From the first beginning of the splendid period of that republic, its political greatness rested on the latter. This preserved its ascendancy ; its allies were maritime cities, and assisted with ships rather than with troops ; and the fate of Athens was decided on the sea, gloriously at Salamis, and fatally in the Hellespont<sup>f</sup>. In Athens, therefore, there was no strong motive for perfecting the art of war by land.

Such were the general obstacles ; others arose from the manner in which the military affairs of the Grecians were regulated. We mention first the situation of the commanders ; at least in Athens and in several other cities<sup>g</sup> ; in which not one, but several generals shared the chief command with one another, and even that usually for a short period of time.

In states where a militia exists, the political divisions are usually military in their origin. Such was the

<sup>e</sup> Thucyd. v. 10. When we read his proclamation addressed to the Acauthians, Thucyd. iv. 85. we believe ourselves brought down to the years 1793 and 1794.

<sup>f</sup> In the year 406 B. C. at Eg spotamus.

<sup>g</sup> As e. g. at Thebes and Syracuse.

case with the tribes at Rome and Athens<sup>h</sup>. The ten Phylæ of this last city had each its own leader; and these together were the generals<sup>i</sup>. Thus it was in the Persian, thus in the Peloponnesian war<sup>k</sup>. That there was a similar regulation in Boeotia, is evident from the number of their commanders; and we learn the same respecting Syracuse, as well from the history of its war with Athens<sup>l</sup>, as from the elevation of Dionysius the first. At Athens, a happy chance secured in the decisive moment, the preponderance to a superior mind, to Miltiades; but where the command was shared by so many, it is obvious that existing institutions could receive but little improvement.

Another still greater obstacle was the circumstance, that the troops were not paid. Before the Peloponnesian war, or at least before the administration of Pericles, no pay was given in Athens or any Grecian city, except perhaps Corinth. Military service was the duty of a citizen; and every one who served was obliged to furnish his own provisions and equipment. But he who receives nothing from the state will not submit to its commands. From that period the custom of paying the troops was so far introduced, that those who had actually taken the field received a very small compensation<sup>m</sup>. With such a constitution, moral motives necessarily outweighed commands. Courage and patriotism can animate an army of citizens, but can hardly make a machine of them; and what advantages would have been gained by him who succeeded in the attempt?

Beside these difficulties, there was in many states another, arising from the weakness of the cavalry, or a total want of it. Homer makes no mention of cavalry.

<sup>h</sup> These were called *tribus* at Rome, *φυλαὶ* at Athens.

<sup>i</sup> The *στρατηγοί*, of whom ten were annually appointed.

<sup>k</sup> Compare the instructive narration in HEROD. vi. 109. respecting the consultation before the battle of Marathon.

<sup>l</sup> THUCYD. vi. 63.

<sup>m</sup> The Athenians paid from two to four oboli daily.

It does not appear to have been introduced in the Grecian states till after the establishment of republican forms of government; since, according to the remark of Aristotle, the opulent citizens found in it at once a support of their power and a gratification of their vanity<sup>a</sup>. But whether a city could have cavalry, depended on the nature of its territory, and the quantity of pasture which it possessed. Where the territory was not favourable, the cavalry was not strong. Athens, where so much attention was paid to this subject, never had more than a thousand horsemen; Sparta appears, before Agesilaus, to have had few, or perhaps originally none at all; the Peloponnesus was little fitted for cavalry; and Thessaly, the only state of the mother country which possessed any considerable body of horse, was not remarkably skilful in making use of it<sup>b</sup>. Where it existed, none but wealthy citizens could serve in it, for the service was expensive. This was the case at Athens<sup>c</sup>; and yet there the state, even in time of peace, provided for the support of the horses; and the weak but splendid cavalry formed no inconsiderable article in the yearly expenditure<sup>d</sup>.

Previously to the Macedonian age, the distinction between heavy and light horse seems to have been unknown in Greece; though it would be too much to assert that a difference in the equipments nowhere prevailed. The Athenian horsemen were equipped much like a modern cuirassier, with breastplate, helmet, and greaves; and even the horses were partly covered<sup>e</sup>. From the exercises which Xenophon prescribes, to leap over ditches and walls, we must suppose that the

<sup>a</sup> On Sparta, consult XENOPH. p. 596.

<sup>b</sup> See the account of their war with the Phocians, PAUSAN. p. 798. The forces of Thessaly (until the tyrants there, as elsewhere, kept mercenaries) seem to have consisted chiefly in cavalry; at least nothing else is mentioned. The surest proof of their little progress in the art of war.

<sup>c</sup> The knights, ἵππεῖς, formed the second class according to property.

<sup>d</sup> According to XENOPH. *de Magist. Equit.* p. 956. it cost 40 talents annually.

<sup>e</sup> XENOPH. *de Re Equestri*, p. 951. has described them minutely.

armour was not very cumbersome<sup>s</sup>. I find no accounts of that of the Thessalian cavalry; but from what Pausanias says of it, it could not have been very light<sup>t</sup>.

With respect to the infantry, the difference between heavy and light armed troops<sup>u</sup> prevailed throughout all Greece. The former were armed for the attack and close conflict. They wore a coat of mail and helmet; the rest of the body was protected by the shield. For the attack they had both spear and sword. The light troops, unincumbered with heavy armour, carried the javelin, with bow and arrows<sup>x</sup>.

The weapons continued, therefore, the same as those which we find used in the Homeric age. But many attempts were made to improve them in various respects. Whether a straight or curved sword was the best<sup>y</sup>; whether a longer or a shorter shield deserved the preference<sup>z</sup>; above all, how the weight of the coat of mail could be diminished, and whether it should be made of metal or of some lighter substance<sup>a</sup>, were questions of no slight importance. Yet before the Macedonian age, we hear of no changes which could give a new character to the whole; and therefore we must leave to the antiquary all farther particular researches.

On the other hand, we will venture (so far as it is permitted to one not initiated in the art of war), to offer some remarks respecting the progress of the Greeks in the art which relates to the positions and manœuvres of armies, all which we comprehend under the word

<sup>s</sup> XENOPH. p. 944.

<sup>t</sup> PAUSAN. p. 797. The horsemen who had been thrown down, being unable to rise, were slain by the Phocians.

<sup>u</sup> οπλῖται and φιλοι. See POTTER'S *Antiquities*.

<sup>x</sup> Bow and arrows do not seem to have been favourite weapons: they are seldom mentioned, and only in connection with certain nations, as the Cretans. Javelins were preferred. These were carried by the cavalry, as appears from XENOPH. II. cc.

<sup>y</sup> XENOPH. p. 953.

<sup>z</sup> Hence the different names; ορφέδς and σάκος, the large shield; ἀσπίς and πιλῆς the small one, etc.

<sup>a</sup> The invention of the lighter coat of mail was due to Iphierates, CORNEL. NEP. in *Iphierat.* c. i.

*tactics.* We desire the more to do this, because it will afford us a favourable opportunity of expressing an opinion on some of their most distinguished generals. The art of tactics is in some respects independent of the progress of the other branches of military science, and in others is necessarily dependent on them. It is independent, so far as we speak of taking advantage of position and ground. The leader of a savage horde may profit by his position, no less than the commander of the best disciplined army. Each will do it in his own way. It is an affair of superior minds, and rules cannot be given on the subject. He can do it to whom nature has given the necessary keenness and quickness of eye. This art is therefore always the property of individuals: it cannot be imparted or improved by instruction. But the very reverse is true of the drawing up of an army, and the manœuvres dependent upon it. These rest upon rules and knowledge, which are lasting; though we willingly grant that this is only the inanimate body of the art, into which genius must breathe life and animation. Modern history has shown by a great example, that those forms may continue in the most courageous and best disciplined army, and yet produce no effect when their spirit has passed away. But here a subject is proposed to the historian of which he can treat. Can this be done better than by comparing together several of the principal engagements, of which detailed accounts have been preserved? Inferences which may thus be drawn respecting the progress of tactics, can hardly be exposed to any considerable errors.

In the Persian war, the victory of Marathon was the first splendid military action of the Greeks, or rather of the Athenians. Athens owed it to the heroic spirit of Miltiades. It was he who turned the scale when it was still a question, whether a battle should be ventured or not. The voices of the ten generals, of whom Miltiades was one, were divided: the eleventh vote of the

Polemarch was to decide. At this moment Miltiades rose and addressed the Polemarch Callimachus<sup>b</sup>: “It now rests with you to reduce Athens to slavery, or, setting it free, to leave a reputation among men, such as neither Harmodius nor Aristogiton has left; for, long as the city of Athens has existed, it has never been in any danger like the present. If it should submit to the Persians, it is already determined what it will suffer under its tyrants; should it be saved, it can become the first of Grecian cities. If we do not join battle, I fear a faction will confuse the minds of the Athenians, and make them Persian; if we fight, victory will, with the aid of the gods, be ours.” Nothing can be related of a great man more important than his conduct in the most decisive moment of his life. Miltiades himself could not have foreseen how much depended on that moment; yet he gained his end, and Callimachus adopted his opinion. But besides the talent of the general, who knew how to avail himself of his position to cover his wings, the victory was not less decided by the discipline of the Athenian militia, accustomed to preserve their ranks while advancing with rapidity. They ran to the encounter<sup>c</sup>; the first of the Greeks who had done so. The wings of the enemy were discomfitted; and the name of Marathon became immortal.

The battle of Plataæ, which happened eleven years later<sup>d</sup>, is one of those of which we have the most accurate accounts<sup>e</sup>. The motions of the army on the preceding days give it an importance for the student of tactics. In his manœuvres the Persian general seems

<sup>b</sup> HEROD. vi. 109.

<sup>c</sup> Ἐν ἐρόμενοι, HEROD. vi. 112. Herodotus says expressly, that they made the attack with closed ranks, οὐθέωντος: we must not therefore think of a violent onset. They had neither cavalry nor archers; as the Swiss at Novara in 1513 were without cavalry and artillery; in each case the result was the same.

<sup>d</sup> In the year 479 B. C.

<sup>e</sup> HEROD. ix. 28 sqq. PLUTARCH, in Aristide, p. 510 sqq. has followed Herodotus.

to have been superior to the Grecian ; for he cut off all their communications, and all supplies of water, and compelled them to change their encampment. But the superior strength of the Persian cavalry made every motion of the Greeks difficult ; and when we remember the internal organization of their army, and the little power possessed by the commander, not only over the allies, but even over his own Spartans<sup>f</sup>, we shall discover still greater difficulties with which Pausanias had to contend. And yet the Greeks obtained a splendid victory ; but it was far more the result of the desperate attack made by the Tegeans and the Spartans, than of skilful manœuvring. In the days which preceded the battle, Pausanias appears as a general of prudence and sound judgment ; he owed the victory not to himself, but to a part of his army and to fortune.

Of the battles which the able and successful Cimon won of the Persians, history has preserved no details ; but yet enough to show that the military art was not advanced by them. They were for the most part naval engagements ; those which took place on land were only unexpected attacks. After his death, Plutarch tells us expressly, that nothing great or considerable was executed<sup>g</sup>.

The first campaigns of the Peloponnesian war show beyond dispute that the art of war had made but little progress. They were mere inroads without any decisive effects. We have already stated the reasons why, in the progress of that long and tedious war, that art advanced so little.

The case was changed, when, after this war, Sparta, contending for the rank she had won, found Agesilaus, and was yet obliged to yield the ascendancy to Thebes. Then the decision was made by armies and not by

<sup>f</sup> See in HERODOTUS, and PLUTARCH, p. 517, the relation of the disobedience of Anompharetes, in confirmation of the remark which we made above, p. 200, on Pausanias.

<sup>g</sup> PLUTARCH, in *Cimone*, p. 217.

navies. In the view of those states, therefore, armies rose in importance.

We will not refuse to Agesilaus any of the praises which Xenophon has lavished on him. He was a model not only of a Spartan but of a Grecian general. In the Spartan method of war, he made one change; in his wars against the Persians in Asia, he was the first to form a numerous cavalry; and to show that he knew the use of it<sup>h</sup>. With this one exception, he made no essential alteration in tactics. The proof of this is found in the description which Xenophon has given of the battle of Coronea<sup>i</sup>. The usual position was taken; the usual method of attack, by opposing a straight line to a straight line, without any manœuvres or artifice, either before or during the battle.

Though it seems clear from this, that the higher branches of the art of war, including tactics, had not made so considerable progress as might have been expected from the greatest of commanders, we would not therefore detract from the fame of those distinguished men. Their glory rests on something independent of the mere movements of their armies. The Grecian general was more closely united to his soldiers; he was obliged to know how to gain the confidence of his fellow-soldiers, who were at the same time his fellow-citizens. This could not be done by commands; rank and birth were of no avail; everything depended on personal character; and to be esteemed a great man it was necessary to give proofs of greatness.

It is the glory of the Greek nation, that it produced, in almost every science and art, the man who first clearly recognised the eternal principles on which it rests, and by the application of them, unconsciously

<sup>h</sup> But that too was only temporary. The battle of Leuctra shows how bad the Spartan cavalry was at a subsequent period. See XENOPH. p. 696.

<sup>i</sup> XENOPH. in Agesil. p. 659.

became the instructor of posterity. In the art of war, such a man arose in Epaminondas. His fame as a warrior is his least glory; the world should behold in him the greatest character of his nation. He was for his age, what Gustavus Adolphus was for a later one. If we take from each of these great men the peculiarities of their times, it will be difficult to find two more congenial spirits, two characters more nearly resembling each other. We leave it for others to draw the parallel; it is of Epaminondas alone, the soldier and general, that we are now to speak. The idea on which his change in the method of war was founded, was as simple as the man himself; and we can hardly fail to observe that it proceeded from his peculiar situation. With an inferior force he had to cope with a more powerful adversary<sup>k</sup>; and this is the true criterion of military genius. It did not escape him that he could not succeed with the received order of battle, in which one line was drawn up in front of the other. Hence he determined to concentrate the attack in one point with a part of his army, and his object was there to break through the enemy's line. In this manner he was triumphant at Leuctra, where he fell upon the right wing of the Spartans. But at Leuctra, the success of the Theban cavalry first turned the fortune of the day; it was at Mantinea, that for the first time a full application was made of the new tactics, which are described to us by one thoroughly acquainted with the subject. "Epaminondas," says Xenophon<sup>l</sup>, "advanced with his army like a galley with threatening prow; sure that if he could once break through the line of his adversaries, a general flight would ensue. He therefore determined to make the attack with the flower of his army, while he reserved the weaker part

<sup>k</sup> The Spartan forces in the battle of Leuctra were thrice as numerous as the Theban; and besides, till that time, had been reckoned invincible.

<sup>l</sup> XENOPHON, *Hell.* vi. 596. We learn from the same passage how much the excellent Theban cavalry (formed by Pelopidas) surpassed the Spartan.

of it." Thus the illustrious Theban solved the great problem in tactics to use at will, by means of its position, the several parts of an army; the art of war, which was thus invented, deserved the name, and was the same which ensured to Alexander the victory on the Granicus, as well as to Frederic at Leuthen. It is easy to perceive that the execution of the plan was a still greater effort than its invention. Troops far better trained than the usual armies of the Greeks, were needed. And it is in this very circumstance, that Xenophon, himself an experienced officer, places the great merit of Epaminondas<sup>m</sup>.

We may therefore say with truth, that the higher branches of the art of war began with Epaminondas to be understood. But even before his time, a change had gradually taken place in the whole military system; a change of the highest importance.

We allude to the custom of paying the troops. In states which originally had no soldiers but their own citizens, the form and the spirit of the military institutions was necessarily changed by the introduction of mercenary troops. These could not have the internal regulations of the native militia, which were founded on the division of the citizens; and although the Swiss mercenaries of the sixteenth century have proved that battles can be gained even with hired soldiers, yet the examples of those times have also proved that evils are inseparable from the custom.

The use of mercenaries in Greece may be traced to a very remote period. The tyrants, those usurpers who rose so early in the different cities, were doubtless the first to introduce it; because they required an armed force to protect their illegal authority. But this force did not always consist of foreigners; but rather, especially in the early times, of an armed body of the citizens, or was selected from among the parti-

sans of the tyrant<sup>n</sup>; and farther, an institution which was regarded as unjust could not continue, still less be adopted and regularly established.

Hired troops, of which we will next treat, began to be employed in the Grecian cities at a later period. In the beginning of the Persian war, at Marathon and at Plataææ we hear nothing of them. In the Peloponnesian war, they were occasionally<sup>o</sup>, and afterwards almost universally, employed. Several causes contributed to produce this effect.

The first was the whole condition of private life. When luxury and the comforts of life were introduced after the Persian invasion, it is not astonishing that the rich desired to be free from military service. On the other hand, the Peloponnesian war and the numerous revolutions produced by it, had so increased the number of the poor, that there was a numerous class who made a profession of war, and were ready to serve any one who would pay them. But it is still more important to remark, that with the Persians, no less than the Greeks, the same change in domestic life produced the same consequences. The Persian subsidies first enabled the Spartans to hire troops. But the Persians soon hired in their turn, and in greater numbers than the Greeks; and no mercenaries were so acceptable, none so indispensable to them, as the Grecian. The high pay which they gave, like the British in modern times, allured numerous troops across the sea; and we need but call to mind the ten thousand whom Clearchus led to Cyrus the younger, and with whom

<sup>n</sup> This was done by Pisistratus at his first usurpation, HEROD. i. 59. In later times, as we may learn from the history of Syracuse, the hired troops of the tyrants were wholly or chiefly composed of foreigners.

<sup>o</sup> The hired troops of the Spartans, from the Peloponnesus, are mentioned as early as the time of Brasidas, THUCYD. iv. 80; those of Athens from Thrace, about the same time, THUCYD. v. 6; those of the Corinthians and others we find constantly mentioned. In the Peloponnesus, it was chiefly the Arcadians who served as mercenaries; hence the proverb among the poets, *ἴξ Ἀρκαδίας τπίκουροι*, ATHEN. i. p. 27. for they did not serve for nothing.

Xenophon made his retreat<sup>p</sup>, to be convinced that great numbers followed this kind of life. Afterwards the Phocian war<sup>q</sup> was conducted by the Phocians, who were aided by the treasures of Delphi, almost exclusively with mercenaries; and Demosthenes is loud in his complaints and censure of a custom, which all his eloquence was not able to change<sup>r</sup>.

Of all writers, Isocrates has spoken the most distinctly on this subject. His long life continued almost through the whole period in which this custom arose; and the consequences were so distinctly visible in his old age, that his patriotism could not but break forth in lamentations. Those very troops of Clearchus and Xenophon, troops which had made the Persians tremble,—what were they? Men, says Isocrates<sup>s</sup>, of such reputation, that they could not reside in their native cities. “Formerly,” says he in another place<sup>t</sup>, “there was no such thing as mercenaries; now the situation of Greece is such, that it would be far easier to raise an army of vagabonds than of citizens.” The natural consequence of this state of things was, that he who had the most money had also the most power. He could raise an army at will. But on how uncertain a foundation did this power repose! The rich can be outbid by the rich; and Greece learned (what Carthage also learned with a more melancholy certainty<sup>u</sup>) that a state which trusts to mercenary troops, must finally tremble before them. “Unless we are careful,” says Isocrates to Philip<sup>x</sup>, “to provide for the support of these people by establishing colonies of them, they will soon collect in vast troops, and be more formidable to the Greeks, than the barbarians<sup>y</sup>.”

<sup>p</sup> In the year 400 B. C.

<sup>q</sup> Called also the sacred war, from 357 till 347 B. C.

<sup>r</sup> See his Philippic and Olynthiac orations.

<sup>s</sup> ISOCRAT. *Panegyr.* p. 71. <sup>t</sup> ISOCRAT. *ad Phil.* p. 101.

<sup>u</sup> In the servile war, 240—237 B. C.

<sup>x</sup> ISOCRAT. *ad Phil.* p. 106.

<sup>y</sup> We learn from Xenophon’s retreat, that they were formidable to their own commanders; as were the Swiss at Milan.

We have already remarked, that in the eyes of the Greeks the navy was more important than the army. The distinction was early made between ships of war and merchant vessels; of which the consequence was, that, as the former belonged to the state, to build and fit out ships was entirely a public concern. Yet to judge correctly of the condition and progress of naval science among the Greeks, we must not forget, that the scene of action for their squadrons was always limited to the Ægean and Ionian seas. The expedition of Athens against Syracuse is the most distant which was ever undertaken by any state of Greece Proper; with what success is known. Even the Black sea, though open to their vessels of commerce, was rarely visited by their galleys of war, because no occasion ever required it. The seas which they navigated were full of islands; it was never difficult to find landing-places and harbours; and the naval expeditions were not much more than passages by sea. Again, Greece, especially the most cultivated eastern part of it, did not abound in wood; and though some of the western or inland districts<sup>z</sup> were better provided with it, the rivers, being hardly more than mountain-streams, afforded little opportunity for the transport of timber. The cities therefore which built fleets were obliged to seek their timber at a distance; and we know that Athens imported its supplies from Thrace<sup>a</sup>. The expense therefore was necessarily great; so that none but the richest cities were able to bear it; and hence it is easy to see, that difficulties arose, which make the exertions of several states for their navy appear to us in a very extraordinary light. Lastly, the manning of the fleets was attended with peculiar difficulties. Two descriptions of men, marines and sailors, were employed. The former were citizens, and belonged to the militia; but, according to the earlier regulations,

<sup>z</sup> As Acarnania and Arcadia.

<sup>a</sup> THUCYD. iv. 108.

the citizens were not obliged to serve on board the ships. Slaves were used in part, especially at the oars; and in part foreigners were hired. Such is the description given by Isocrates. "Formerly," says he<sup>b</sup>, "in the better times of Athens, foreigners and slaves were used in the management of the vessels; but citizens performed military service. Now the case is reversed; the natives are compelled to serve as seamen<sup>c</sup>, while the soldiers consist of mercenaries." The manning of the fleets was therefore attended with great expense; and it is known from the Peloponnesian war, that, but for the alliance and subsidies of Persia, Sparta could not have supported it.

These causes are sufficient to prevent us from forming unreasonable expectations of the naval power of the Greeks. Yet here, also, the different epochs must be distinguished.

We learn from Homer and the Argonautic poets, that the Greeks, even in the heroic age, had ships which were fitted out for distant voyages. The piracy, which before that period had been so common, made it necessary for ships to be prepared, not only for carrying freight, but for fighting. These vessels were called *long*, by way of distinguishing them from the more ancient round ones, which were fit only for the transportation of merchandise; though it is certain that the former were also used for the purposes of commerce. They were so constructed that all the rowers sat in one line. In times of insecurity, swiftness is the chief merit of a vessel, whether for attack or for flight. This property must have been increased in the lengthened vessels, both by the form itself, and the increased number of rowers; which gradually rose from twenty to fifty and even more. Hence there was

<sup>b</sup> ISOCRAT. *de Pace*, p. 169. See SCHEFFER *de Milit. Naut.* ii. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Especially the resident aliens. See above, p. 197.

a class of ships, which derived their name from that circumstance<sup>d</sup>.

But the incident which made a real and indeed the only epoch in the history of Grecian naval architecture, is the invention of the triremes. They were distinguished by the triple rank of benches for rowing, placed one above the other<sup>e</sup>. It thus became necessary to build the vessels much higher; and though swiftness was carefully attended to, strength and firmness must have been considered of equal importance. Even before the Macedonian age, and always after it, the chief strength of the Grecian fleet lay in the triremes, in the same manner that in modern fleets the principal force is in ships of the line of the second and third rate.

The structure of the triremes would alone warrant the inference, that a naval force, that is, a squadron destined solely for war, and possessed by the state, did not exist in Greece till after the invention of these vessels. But there is in Thucydides<sup>f</sup> a passage which, in my opinion, settles this point beyond a doubt. "When, after the abolition of kingly governments, the cities became more wealthy, the Greeks began to build fleets, and to pay more attention to naval affairs. The Corinthians were the first to change the ships according to our present form; for in Greece the first triremes were built at Corinth; and it was the ship-builder Aminocles of Corinth, who built for the Samians four such vessels. But it was about three hundred years before the end of this war<sup>g</sup> that Aminocles came to the Samians. The first seafight with which we are acquainted, was fought between the Corinthians and the

<sup>d</sup> The πεντηκόντοροι. See SCHEFFER de Varietate Nav. in GRONOV. *Thes.* vol. xi. p. 752.

<sup>e</sup> SCHEFFER de Milit. Nav. ii. 2. I believe this point, once so much contested, is now no longer doubted; although uncertainty still exists respecting the order of the rows. Compare the prints and illustrations in the *Antichità d'Ercolano*, tom. v. at the end.

<sup>f</sup> THUCYD. i. 13.

<sup>g</sup> About 700 B. C.

Corycraeans; since that time, two hundred and sixty years have elapsed<sup>h</sup>."

This testimony, more important than all the accounts of later grammarians and compilers, proves that it was in the seventh century that the Grecian states began to maintain fleets. The account of the great historian is illustrated by our former inquiries on Grecian commerce<sup>i</sup>, which show that the same period beheld the many Grecian cities, planted on the seacoast from Asia to Sicily, rise and flourish in the genial beams of liberty. The year, it is true, is not mentioned in which the first triremes were built at Corinth; but the whole context shows that the invention was still recent in the age of Aminocles; and as the first naval battle between the Greeks was fought forty years later, it is obvious that at that period they were only beginning to support fleets.

But at the same time we must confess that naval architecture, after this first great step, made no farther considerable advances before the Macedonian age. Thucydides states this expressly: for he observes, that the Corinthians gave the ships the form which they continued to have in his time. Neither did it at once become a general custom to build triremes. Until the Persian war, the use of long ships and those of fifty oars was the most usual; the Syracusans and Corycraeans were, about this time, the first who had whole fleets consisting of triremes<sup>k</sup>. In these, though many partial improvements were perhaps made, no essential change took place; and therefore we leave this subject, and many others relating to naval matters, to the industry of the antiquarian.

We will only add a few remarks on the naval tactics of the Greeks. Did they receive a regular and artificial form earlier than the military? And if so, through whom, and by what means? And here the reader

<sup>h</sup> About 640 B. C.

<sup>i</sup> See above, p. 123, 4.

<sup>k</sup> THUCYD. i. 14.

must not forget that we are treating of the times previous to the dominion of the Macedonians.

It is apparent from the preceding observations, that the Greeks had more reason to improve their naval than<sup>1</sup> their military tactics. They were often obliged to contend with fleets, superior to their own not only in number, but also in the excellence of vessels; thus in the Persian war the squadrons of the Phœnicians were arrayed against them. Even when the victory had been gained, the safety of Greece still depended on its maritime force. This formed the foundation of the greatness of the first among the Grecian cities. Naval actions, more than battles by land, decided the destiny of the rival powers. What circumstances could be more favourable to the display of great talents? And where may we indulge greater expectations, especially when we look through the lists of the men to whom Athens and Sparta intrusted the command of their navies?

We can best begin the history of the naval tactics of Greece, at the period when we have descriptions of their engagements at sea. The earliest account which we possess is of the battle which took place near the island of Lada, off Miletus, between the Ionian fleet and that of the Phœnicians in the service of Persia. The navy of the Ionians had then reached its greatest perfection; it consisted of not less than three hundred and fifty triremes, while that of the Phœnicians was almost twice as large. We find that an advantageous position was taken in the days before the battle. In the divisions of the first line, there were intervals through which those of the second could sail<sup>1</sup>. But the battle itself is not instructive, as the Persians succeeded in first dividing the fleet of the allies.

When Xerxes invaded Greece, Themistocles gained the glory of being the preserver of his country by sea.

<sup>1</sup> Herod. vi. 12 sqq. Here too we have an instance of how little could be effected by the commander.

But it must not be forgotten, that though he was the commander of the Athenians, he had not the command of the allies. This post he had the prudence and moderation to yield, at least nominally, to Eurybiades the Spartan<sup>m</sup>. Still it was Themistocles who directed the whole, not by commands, but by persuasion; and in this art no one was equal to him. Twice he ventured to meet the superior navy of the Persians; first at Artemisium, then at Salamis. But in both instances he remedied his inferiority, not so much by artful manœuvres, as by the choice of his position. He would not meet the immense Persian fleet in the open sea; where the wings of the enemy would have unavoidably extended beyond his own. Hence he chose his first position at the northern entrance of the strait of Eubœa<sup>n</sup>, and after the indecisive engagements of Artemisium, retreated through those straits to the Saronic bay; where the narrow straits between Attica and the island of Salamis offered a still securer station. In such a position, where the enemy is expected in close array, manœuvres are not farther needed; but the relation of Herodotus leaves us in doubt, whether most to admire the discernment, or the prudence and adroitness of the commander.

Of the seafights which afterwards took place in the course of this war, we have only general accounts. The Greeks beat the Persians too easily. When an enemy is despised, the art of war cannot make much progress.

We have particular accounts<sup>o</sup> of the seafight, which, at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, took place between the Coreyraeans and Corinthians; and after which both nations erected a trophy. The fleet of

<sup>m</sup> On this and what follows consult the interesting narrative of HERODOTUS, viii. 2.

<sup>n</sup> In the Euripus. The Persians sent a part of their fleet round the island, to block up the southern entrance, and thus cut off the retreat of the Greeks; but their squadron was destroyed by a storm. HEROD. I. c.

<sup>o</sup> THUCYD. i. 47 sqq.

the Corinthians formed one line; while that of the Corcyraeans was drawn up in three divisions. But the historian remarks that no manœuvres took place; they grappled at once, and ship fought singly with ship. All that we read of the fleet of the Corcyraeans gives us a low opinion of their skill in naval tactics. In a second naval engagement with the Peloponnesians, they showed still less adroitness, and would have been ruined if the division of the Athenians had not covered their retreat<sup>p</sup>.

The naval tactics which were now known to the Greeks, consisted chiefly in sailing round and through the enemy's line<sup>q</sup>. The object of the first was to extend the line beyond the opposite wings; of the second, to break through that of the enemy. To prevent this, the other fleet was drawn up in two lines, and with intervals, so that the divisions of the second line could pass through the intervals in the first, and thus assist them when assistance was needed. This order was particularly understood by the Athenians, who also adopted another method of attack, not with the prow, but obliquely from the side; so that the oars of the enemy's ship were broken, and the ship thus made unmanageable. In those matters, the Athenians were superior not only to the Spartans, but even to the Syracusans<sup>r</sup>.

The last two years of the Peloponnesian war were particularly remarkable for naval encounters; but for a knowledge of tactics, the engagement between the Spartans under Callicratidas, and the Athenians, near Lesbos, alone deserves notice; for it gives us an example of the management of a squadron in a double line. The Athenian fleet was drawn up in two lines, both on the right and the left wing. Each wing consisted of two divisions, each division of fifteen ships;

<sup>p</sup> THUCYD. iii. 77, 78.

<sup>q</sup> Περιπλεῖν and διεκπλεῖν. THUCYD. vii. 36; XENOPH. Hell. i. p. 446.

<sup>r</sup> See the description of the fight in THUCYD. l. c.

and was supported by equal divisions in the second line; the centre was composed of one line. "This order," says Xenophon<sup>5</sup>, "was chosen, that the fleet might not be broken through." The Spartan fleet, on the contrary, formed but one line, prepared for sailing round, or breaking through the enemy. The battle was obstinate; it was long before the Athenians gained the victory, when Callicratidas fell. His steersman, before the battle, had advised him to retreat, on account of the greatly superior force of the Athenians. "Were I to fall, Sparta could exist as well without me," was his answer.

The naval tactics of the ancients were farther improved in the wars between the Romans and Carthaginians, and under the Ptolemies. In forming an opinion respecting them, two things should be borne in mind. First; less depended on the wind than in modern tactics; for the triremes were moved more by oars than sails. Secondly: when battles were fought hand to hand, and the ships always ran along side of each other, the manœuvres of the fleets could not be so various or decisive as when the ships remain at a certain distance, and manœuvres can be performed during the whole action. But though the naval tactics of the moderns are more difficult and intricate, we must not conclude that the seafights of the ancients were comparatively insignificant. They decided wars in ancient much more frequently than in modern times; and if the loss of men is to be taken into consideration, it might easily be shown, that one naval engagement of the ancients often swept away more men, than three, or even more, in our days.

## CHAPTER XIII.

### STATESMEN AND ORATORS.

THE character of a statesman in republics similar to those of Greece, must differ in many respects from that of the statesman of modern European monarchies; and it is difficult to describe it accurately. Nevertheless the subject of this work requires that we should form a distinct conception of the sphere of action, in which the public men of Greece exerted themselves: and in so doing we may perhaps learn to form a more just estimate of the character of some of them. Though in most cases Athens was their home and the theatre of their actions, they were the property of Greece generally; and are here to be held up as the representatives of many others, of whom history has preserved less information, only because they appeared in cities of less renown.

The different character of the Grecian states necessarily exercised an influence on the character of the statesman who appeared in them. Where, as in Sparta, the law exercised unlimited power, demagogues like those of Athens could not arise. But difference of time exercised as great an influence as the difference of constitutions. It was therefore natural that with the increasing civilization of the nation, there should be a change in the influence and the conduct of those who were at its head.

In the age of Solon, men first appeared, especially in the parent states, who were worthy of the name of statesmen. Many had before that period been in possession of power, and not unfrequently had become

tyrants; but none can be called statesmen, as the word itself denotes, except those who, as freemen, conduct the affairs of civilized nations.

In the time of Solon<sup>a</sup>, the relations of the Grecian states had not yet become intricate. No one of them exercised a considerable influence over the rest; and no one endeavoured to do so; even the importance of Sparta in the Peloponnesus arose solely from her attempts to liberate the cities from the yoke of their tyrants. In such a period, when the individual states were chiefly occupied with their own concerns and those of their nearest neighbours, the sphere of the statesman's action could not, for any length of time, be extended beyond the internal government and administration. The seven wise men, from whom the Greeks date the age in which politics began to be a science, were not speculative philosophers, but princes, lawgivers, and counsellors of states; rulers, as Periander of Corinth, and Pittacus of Mitylene; lawgivers, as Solon of Athens, Chilo of Sparta, Cleobulus of Lindus; counsellors, as Bias and Thales, of various princees and cities<sup>b</sup>. Of these, Solon is the only one with whom we are much acquainted; he is known as a legislator, and also as a soldier and poet. But it was not till after the Persian war that the men appeared, whom we can call statesmen in the modern sense of the word. For it was then, for the first time, when a contest arose with a nation apparently far superior in power, and the question of national existence was at issue, that good counsel became not less important than action, and a political interest was excited strong enough to employ the most powerful minds. This interest was not, and could not, be transitory, for it gave birth in Greece to the idea of supremacy, which a single state obtained and preserved for nearly seventy years; and

<sup>a</sup> Between 600 and 550 B. C.

<sup>b</sup> See DIOC. LAERT. i. 1—5. The passages which relate to them have already been collected and illustrated by Meiners and other writers on the history of philosophy. MEINERS *Geschichte der Wissenschaften*, vol. i. p. 43.

which, as we have already remarked<sup>c</sup>, became the foundation of its greatness and its splendour. Political affairs and negotiations were now to be judged of by a new criterion. Foreign relations were now the most important; and it was in conducting them that the first statesmen were employed. But the sphere of their action was by no means limited to Athens alone; it was in some measure extended over the whole of Greece.

The object of these men necessarily was to gain influence in a community, in which though some inequality was produced by birth (as certain families, like those of the Eupatridæ, were held superior to the rest, forming a sort of nobility, and even a political party), yet it exercised very little influence on the future elevation of individuals. In Athens, as in England, certain families or classes of families maintained certain political ideas and principles, by means of which the democratical and aristocratical parties were formed, and kept up amidst a variety of changes. But the history of Athens still abounds in proofs, that the influence possessed over the people did not depend on birth. Here, as in the other similar states, there were two methods of gaining such influence, by deeds in war, and by counsel in peace. At some periods military glory was the most esteemed; in others, influence could be gained without it. In the early age, during the Persian war, the commanders of the armies were also statesmen; and how could it be otherwise? But when the affairs of peace grew more important, a new course was opened to men of genius. Yet it was long before a statesman, as such, could rise in Athens; the qualifications of a general long remained essential to his influence; though the age at length arrived in which the former began to be of more consequence than the latter. We shall not therefore expose ourselves to the

<sup>c</sup> See above, p. 129.

danger of being misapprehended, if we distinguish the three periods one from another; the first, in which the statesman was subordinate to the general; the next, in which the general was subordinate to the statesman; and the third, in which the statesman acted independently of the general. Without any elaborate argument, the reader will immediately perceive that this change bore a certain relation to the increasing civilization of the nation; the mere military commander may rule a nation of barbarians; but the statesman who has no pretensions to the qualifications of a general, finds no place except among a cultivated people. To mark more distinctly the limits of the three periods, we will call the first that of Themistocles, the second that of Pericles, and the third that of Demosthenes.

In the first age it is easy to perceive, that the qualities of a commander were of more importance than those of a statesman. The state was to be saved on the field of battle; and yet prudence was needed for its safety no less than courage. Themistocles himself may be regarded as the representative of this period. Destined by nature to become a demagogue rather than a general, he was still forced by the character and the spirit of his age to found his political influence on his military fame. He owed his greatness to the Persian war and Salamis. But though a general, he is perhaps also the most perfect model of a popular leader, as he accomplished less by commands than by persuasion and a knowledge of mankind. His nation recognised in him the most prudent of its citizens; and he understood his nation better than any one, not merely collectively, but individually. Hence arose his influence. "He was most distinguished," says Thucydides<sup>4</sup>, "for the strength of his natural powers; and for this he is the most admirable of men. His under-

<sup>4</sup> THUCYD. i. 138.

standing made him the most acute observer of every unexpected incident, without any previous or subsequent inquiries; and gave him the most accurate foresight of the future. Whatever he undertook, he was able to execute; and to form a true judgment on whatever was new to him. In doubtful matters, he could best tell what was to be done or to be avoided; and, in a word, he had no equal either for strength of natural powers, or for promptness of decision." Happy the state which is blessed with such a citizen? Even in great dangers it has no need to fear. He who considers the whole history of Themistocles, will admire him less for his deeds of heroism than for the manner in which he preserved the courage of his nation, and in the decisive moment, prevailed on them to adopt the decisive measure, rather to enter their ships and desert their native city, than subject themselves to the Persian yoke. Such things can be done only by a man of superior genius. It is true that his great talents were united to a character, which was not entirely free from selfishness<sup>e</sup>. But the interests of his country were never sacrificed to his private advantage. And in judging of Themistocles, it must never be forgotten, that he was the first, who, without family, rose to eminence in Athens, and destroyed the power of the nobility<sup>f</sup>. This could never be forgiven him; and it is not strange, that persecuted as he was by Sparta, he should have been overwhelmed by his foreign and domestic enemies. But when he quitted ungrateful Athens, his object was already accomplished. He had practically demonstrated that he understood the art which he vaunted, of making a small state a large one. The reception which he met with in Persia, does no less honour to him than to Artaxerxes; and although

<sup>e</sup> See in particular the relation of the corruption of the Grecian generals by the Eubœans, HEROD. viii. 5.

<sup>f</sup> PLUTARCH, in *Themistoc.* p. 438.

it is doubtful whether he did not, by a voluntary death, escape serving against his country<sup>g</sup>, it is certain that he did nothing which could sully his fame.

If Themistocles shows how talents could force their way in a state like Athens, Aristides is an example of the influence of character. His influence and his share in public affairs were grounded on the conviction of his honesty and disinterestedness; although he also needed the support of military glory. As early as the battle of Marathon, he, as one of the ten generals, stood by the side of Miltiades; and had himself the magnanimity to yield to him the supreme command<sup>h</sup>. At Plataæ, he was the leader of the Athenians; and after the liberties of Greece had been rescued by this victory, and Athens had established its supremacy in the alliance against Persia, he was appointed, at the request of the allies, to superintend the treasury, and performed the difficult office of fixing for each of them its share of the annual tribute<sup>i</sup>. Thus Athens owed to him not much less than to Themistocles, who had been his rival from youth. If political and moral principles rendered the union of the two impossible (nothing but the urgent necessities of the country effected it for a short time), it must not be forgotten, that Aristides, though probably not of an opulent family<sup>k</sup>, belonged by birth to the order of the Eupatridæ.

<sup>g</sup> "He died," says Thucydides, "of disease. Some say he died of poison, which he took because he could not perform all that he had promised the king," i. 138. Thucydides says nothing of the tradition, which afterwards became general, that he destroyed himself by drinking bull's blood, PLUTARCH, p. 498. The story seems therefore to have received additions; Thucydides speaks so decidedly, that he could hardly have doubted the natural death of Themistocles.

<sup>h</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. i. p. 489.

<sup>i</sup> "Aristides," says Plutarch, "made inquiries respecting the territory and revenue of the several states; and fixed accordingly the tribute of each state to general satisfaction, PLUTARCH, vol. ii. p. 535. But even before that time it was his character, which had gained for Athens the supremacy. For the allies desired a president like him; and even invited him to assume the supreme command, PLUTARCH, vol. ii. p. 532. He was at that time general of the Athenians with Cimon.

<sup>k</sup> How uncertain this was, appears from PLUTARCH, vol. iii. p. 478.

Cimon, the son of Miltiades, the third whom we should name in this first period, connects it, as it were, with the succeeding. He too was more of a general than a statesman. His policy had but one object, viz. continual war against the Persians, as the means of preserving the unity of the Greeks. This he pursued through his whole life, from the battle of Salamis, (and he had been the first to give the example of deserting the city and entering the ships<sup>1</sup>), till shortly before the glorious peace which he had promoted, but did not live to see concluded<sup>m</sup>. He seems, therefore, to have taken no farther share in the internal management of the state than he was forced to do by his situation. For, descended from a noble family, and a pupil of Aristides, possessing the principles of his political instructor, he desired the favour of the people, only as the means of preserving his character as a military commander; and yet he did not escape the lot which befel Themistocles and Aristides. But his military fame procured his speedy return; and confirmed him, as it increased, in the possession of his place. It was by the means which Cimon used to preserve the favour of the people, that he held a place, as we have observed, between the first and second period. His liberality was not confined to citizens alone; even he began to attract attention by public improvements, made for the most part at his own expense. Themistocles had fortified the city and the Piræus; and Cimon began to ornament them. With the Persian spoils he built a part of the walls of the Acropolis<sup>n</sup>. He caused the marshy ground at its side<sup>o</sup> to be dried and paved; he prepared an abode for Plato and the disciples of his philosophy, by converting the barren field, which occupied the site of the Academy, into a delightful well-watered grove; and for the Athenians

<sup>1</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. iii. p. 181.  
<sup>o</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. iii. p. 202.

<sup>m</sup> He died in 449 B. C.  
<sup>n</sup> Called *ai λίμναι*.

he made the market-place, their favourite place of resort, by planting it with plane trees<sup>p</sup>. He was intimately acquainted with the artists of his time, especially with the painter Polygnotus; to whose art and patriotism the Athenians were indebted for the paintings which decorated the most celebrated of their public porticoes<sup>q</sup>.

Cimon may therefore justly be styled the precursor of Pericles, whose name we use to designate the second period. The time was arrived when the arts of peace were to flourish no less than those of war; when almost every branch of the arts and of literature were to put forth their most beautiful and most enduring blossoms.

Under such circumstances, and in a republic of which no one could possess the direction without understanding the means of winning and preserving the respect and admiration of his fellow-citizens, it is obvious that new qualities were necessary in the statesman. The reciprocal influence which exists between men of genius and the age in which they live, is perhaps one of the most interesting inquiries for which history presents us the materials. When we survey the several periods in which, at a greater or less distance, the remarkable changes of particular nations, and even of a large part of mankind, have taken place, we shall always find in them individual men, who may in some measure be regarded as the representatives of their age; and who frequently and justly lend their names to it. They can in a certain degree rise above their age; but they do not the less remain children of the time in which they live; and a history of mankind, as contained in the history of these leading minds, would perhaps be the most faithful that can be given. He who has truly delineated Arminius and Cæsar, or

<sup>p</sup> PLUTARCH, l. c.

<sup>q</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. ii. p. 178. Hence called the *variegated*, ποικίλη. It was adjoining to the market-place.

Gregory, or Luther, or Frederic, has sketched the great features of their respective ages. To be in advance of one's age, as it is called, means but to understand one's age correctly in all its bearings; and to act on the principles which result from that knowledge. In this lies the secret of great men, that no one can vie with or expose them, because no one shares their penetration, or what in many cases may rather be called their presaging insight into the future. On hearing the age of Pericles mentioned, how glorious a crowd of associations is called up! To behold the mere citizen of a republic raising his nation, and, by means of his nation, all mankind, to a higher position, is a spectacle which history has only once, under similar circumstances, been able to repeat, viz. in Lorenzo the Magnificent. Envious men, around whose brows the unfading laurel twines its verdure! If fame in succeeding generations, if the grateful remembrance of posterity is no vain felicity, who would not willingly exchange his claims for yours?

In his political course, Pericles was guided by a simple principle; to be the first man in his own city, and to make his own city the first in Greece. Its political preponderance depended on the preservation of its supremacy over Greece<sup>r</sup>; and this was to be preserved, not by force alone, but by everything which, according to Grecian ideas, could render a city illustrious. Hence he himself felt the necessity of improving his mind more variously than had hitherto been common in Athens; and for that end he availed himself of all the means which his age afforded him. He was the first statesman who perceived that a certain degree of acquaintance with philosophy was requisite; not in order to involve his mind in the intricacies of a system, but to exercise himself in thinking with freedom; and he became the pupil of Anaxagoras<sup>s</sup>. If we are to

<sup>r</sup> See above, p. 129.

<sup>s</sup> In proof of this and of what follows, see PLUTARCH'S *Life of Pericles*.

believe that before his time no orators, except those appointed by the state, had spoken in the popular assemblies, he was the first who came forward as a voluntary orator<sup>t</sup>; and the study of eloquence was necessary for him, although he never made the duties of an active statesman subordinate to those of a public speaker. Whilst he ornamented Athens by those masterpieces of architecture and the arts of design, he was not the patron but the personal friend of Phidias and similar men; and who does not know, that his intimacy with Aspasia, his friend, his mistress, and at last his wife, imparted to his mind that finer culture, which he would have looked for in vain among the free women of Athens? But all this he made subservient to his public career. He desired to be altogether a statesman, and he was so. "There was in the whole city," says Plutarch<sup>u</sup>, "but one street in which he was ever seen; the street which led to the market-place and the council-house. He declined all invitations to banquets, and all gay assemblies and company. During the whole period of his administration he never dined at the table of a friend; he only just made his appearance at the nuptials of his nephew Euryptolemus; but immediately after the libation<sup>x</sup> he arose. He did not always appear even in the popular assemblies; but only when important business was to be transacted; smaller concerns he intrusted to his friends and the orators." Thus Pericles exhibited a model of a statesman, such as Greece had never yet seen, and was not to see again. His history shows, that he became great amidst the collision of parties; all of which he finally annihilated; and we need not therefore be astonished

<sup>t</sup> PLUTARCH makes a distinction between him and the orators appointed by the state; i. e. p. 601. See PETIT. *Lig. Att.* iii. 3.

<sup>u</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. ii. p. 601.

<sup>x</sup> That is, at the beginning of the repast. These little traits seem to me to designate the man, who never allowed himself anything. What nobler object can be contemplated, than a great statesman, who, living entirely for his high calling, and living worthily of it, spares only moments for himself?

if the opinions of his contemporaries were not united in his favour. We learn from Plutarch<sup>y</sup>, how constantly the comic poets attacked him. But he has gained the voice of one man, whose authority surpasses that of all the rest, the voice of Thucydides. "So long as he presided over the state in peace," says the historian<sup>z</sup>, "he did it with moderation; the state was preserved in its integrity, and was even advanced under him to its highest degree of greatness. When the war broke out, he showed that he had made a just calculation of his strength. The first in dignity and prudence, he was superior to all suspicion of corruption; he therefore swayed the people almost at will; he guided them, and was not guided by them; for he did not speak according to their humour, but often opposed them with dignity, and even with vehemence. If they were inclined to do anything unreasonably, he knew how to restrain them; if they suffered their courage to sink without reason, he could restore their confidence. His administration was therefore nominally the government of the people, but in reality the government of the first man." To a character described by such a master, no additions need be made; but we cannot omit to observe, that Pericles, though so great as a statesman, was not unmindful of the fame of military command. In this his rule of conduct seems to have been, great prudence, and to undertake nothing without the highest probability of success; and such was the confidence reposed in him, that in the last fifteen years of his administration, he seems to have held the place of general without interruption<sup>z</sup>.

While we render to Pericles the tribute of just admiration, we ought not to forget that he was favoured by the circumstances of his times. A man of his capacity is capable of effecting much when the state over which

<sup>y</sup> As, e. g. vol. ii. p. 592.

<sup>z</sup> THUCYD. ii. 65.

<sup>a</sup> Viz. after his victory over his antagonist, the elder Thucydides, who was supported by the aristocratical party. PLUTARCH, vol. ii. p. 626, 627.

he presides is flourishing, and the people itself is constantly developing talents and powers of which he must be able to take advantage. Pericles himself never could have played his part a second time; how much less those who were his successors. Of these history has but one to mention, of whom we must take notice, because he belonged, in a certain sense, not to Athens only, but to Greece; we mean Alcibiades. The age in which he appeared was altogether warlike; and for this he was himself to blame. He needed, therefore, the qualifications of a general more than those of a statesman. Still it may be said with confidence, that even in better times he would not have become a Pericles, although he seemed destined by birth, talents, and fortune, to play a similar part. Pericles regarded, in everything, first the state and then himself; while Alcibiades first considered himself, and then the state. Is more required to delineate his character as a statesman? Vanity was his leading trait. He is thus described by the same great historian who has drawn for us the picture of Pericles. "Although Alcibiades," says he<sup>b</sup>, "was distinguished among his fellow-citizens for his wealth and consequence, his desires were always greater than his fortune; particularly of keeping splendid equipages, and supporting other extravagances; which contributed not a little to the downfall of the Athenians." His history is so well known, that it is not necessary to establish these remarks by any particular references; his whole life from beginning to end is a confirmation of them.

The men who have thus far been named, united, though in different degrees, the characters of the statesman and the general. By what means, then, was such an entire separation of the two produced, as may be observed in the third period, which we have named after Demosthenes? His name alone explains to us

distinctly enough, that the reason is to be looked for in the dominion of eloquence; but the question remains still to be answered, Why and from what causes did eloquence obtain so late an ascendancy in politics?

We do not read that Themistocles and Aristides were skilled in oratory as an art. It is certain that of all practical statesmen, Pericles was the first who deserved that praise; although it is uncertain whether he took advantage of the instructions which then began to be given by the teachers of eloquence<sup>c</sup>. But though the orations of Pericles were artfully composed, they cannot be called works of art in the same sense with those of Demosthenes and his contemporaries. As Pericles left no writings, it must remain undecided, whether he prepared his speeches before they were delivered. A circumstance recorded by Plutarch appears to make this very uncertain. "He was accustomed," says the biographer<sup>d</sup>, "whenever he was to speak in public, previously to entreat the gods, that he might not utter, unintentionally, any word which should not belong to the subject." Does not this seem to show, that he was not accustomed to write his orations, and deliver them from memory, but rather that he left much to be filled up by the impulse of the moment? The speech which Thucydides represents him to have delivered<sup>e</sup>, is the work of the historian; but we can judge from that and other similar speeches in the same author, of the character of public eloquence before and during the Peloponnesian war; since they could not but be composed in the taste and after the manner of the times. But how do they differ in style from those of the age of Demosthenes! How much less can those

<sup>c</sup> According to PLUTARCH, vol. i. p. 594, the sophist Damon was his instructor; but, as it appears, rather his political counsellor than his regular instructor in eloquence. He made use of the pretext, says Plutarch, of teaching him music. Gorgias of Leontium, who is commonly mentioned as the first of the class of sophists, can hardly have been his master. See the fragment from the *Schol. ad Hermog.* ap. Reisk. *Or. Gr.* vol. viii. p. 195.

<sup>d</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. ii. p. 604.

<sup>e</sup> THUCYD. iii. 60.

orations, great as are their various merits, be considered as classical models of eloquence! We find in them little or nothing of an artificial plan; little of that rhetorical amplification, and those figures and artifices, by which the later orators produced an effect on their hearers. We justly admire in them the strength of many of their thoughts, and single expressions and passages. But they seem to prove beyond a question, that the rhetorical style was not then formed at Athens. They have far more the character of military addresses; they bear the impress of an age, in which the orator in the popular assemblies was also the commander in war<sup>f</sup>.

And by what means did the Grecian style of public speaking gain that peculiar character, which it possessed in the age of Demosthenes? The origin and progress of public speaking always depend, in a certain degree, on external circumstances. It is not enough that the constitution admits of it, for then it would have come to perfection in other Grecian cities, and in Athens at a much earlier period than it did. Neither can we assume the artificial disposition of the parts of a discourse and the instruction given in rhetoric, as the standard by which to judge of the actual appearance of great political orators. External circumstances must also be such as to make the want of orators perceptible. And when can this take place in free republics, except in times—not of war, for there arms must decide; but rather—of impending dangers, which may yet be averted by prudence and courageous resolutions? In such times the public speaker is in his place; he beholds the field of glory opened to him; and if no other motive than patriotism should lead him to ascend the stage from which the people was ad-

<sup>f</sup> In the masterly sketch which is given by CICERO, in *Bruto*, cap. 7—13, of the succession of Greek orators, much instruction on these subjects may be found.

dressed, where could his bosom be warmed by a nobler inspiration?

This was the case in Greece, and especially at Athens, during the age of Philip; for it was Philip who called forth Demosthenes. Everything which was needed to produce such an orator, had already been prepared. The form of government had long since made public speaking customary, and had opened the way for its influence. Eloquence was no longer regarded as merely a gift of nature, but as the fruit of study; and the orator spoke to a people, which was sufficiently well informed to understand and estimate his merits. To this were added those external causes which arose from the difficult relations of the times. Where could there have been a better field for great public speakers? Where would their appearance have been more easily accounted for? Where was it more natural, that the practical statesman should more earnestly apply himself to the study of eloquence? and thus the third period, distinguished by us, be introduced, in which the mere orator, without the talents of a military commander, could direct the affairs of the state.

But when we investigate the history of practical eloquence in Greece (for it is that of which we speak, and not of the theory), we are soon led to remark, what deserves to be carefully considered; that in this last period of time political and forensic eloquence became much more closely connected than before. The men who in the earlier times had been at the head of the state, Pericles, Alcibiades, and the rest, did not make their way to eminence by the business of advocates. Though in individual cases, as Pericles in that of Cimon<sup>5</sup>, they appeared as accusers in public trials, they never made a profession of pleading in the courts of justice, as did the orators of the age of Demosthenes. This gives rise to an important question

<sup>5</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. i. p. 610. And even then, as the writer remarks, he was rather apparently than really an accuser.

in the history of practical politics no less than of oratory: when did the advocates in Greece become statesmen; and by what means did they become so?

If I am not mistaken, it is not difficult to prove, that during and by means of the Peloponnesian war, the labours of the advocate and the statesman first came to be united. The state trials, as is apparent from our former remarks on the judicial institutions, produced this result. But these began to be numerous during and immediately after that war; and they could not have become very frequent, though individual instances occurred, before the spirit of faction which supported them had taken too deep a root to be extirpated. Of the orators with whom we are acquainted, Antiphon is the earliest who must here be mentioned. The sketch drawn of him by Thucydides, represents a man, who, properly an advocate, was drawn into public affairs against his inclination; and at last was obliged to defend his life for it<sup>h</sup>. Of his contemporaries, Andocides and Lysias, the first would probably have long played a conspicuous part in politics but for his restless spirit and his want of principle<sup>i</sup>. His rival Lysias, as appears from his extant orations, was a mere advocate; but his speeches were chiefly delivered on questions of public law; and the eloquence of the bar naturally rose to a higher degree of consideration, as trials not only were multiplied, but also increased in importance. In this manner, by the multitude of public lawsuits, the path of the advocate was opened to a share in the business of the state; and the characters of orator and statesman became inseparable. This is nowhere more distinctly perceived, than in the writings of Isocrates, which are so often instructive on these subjects. He, who was only a teacher of eloquence (for he was conscious of being too timid to speak in public), esteemed himself no less a teacher of political science; and as he never delivered

<sup>h</sup> THUCYD. viii. 68.

<sup>i</sup> HAUPTMANN *de Andocide*, ap. Reisk. vol. viii. p. 535.

discourses concerning public affairs, he wrote respecting them<sup>k</sup>. Several of his essays are of the nature of memorials, addressed by him to rulers and kings; although his friends had warned him how dangerous this kind of writing might prove for him<sup>l</sup>. They produced no greater effect than such writings commonly do, where they are not supported by personal connections; but no one will deny, that his instructions contributed much towards the education of many orators and statesmen<sup>m</sup>.

Nothing could be more superfluous, than the desire of becoming the eulogist of that great master, whom the united voice of so many ages has declared to be the first; and whose panegyric the only rival whom antiquity had placed by his side, has pronounced in a manner at once accurate and honourable to both<sup>n</sup>. We would not here speak of Demosthenes the orator, but of Demosthenes the statesman; and of him only as far as the man, the orator, and the statesman were intimately combined. His political principles emanated from the depth of his soul; he remained true to his feelings and his convictions, amidst all changes of circumstances and all threatening dangers. Hence he was the most powerful of orators; because with him there was no surrender of his conviction, no partial compromise; in a word, no trace of weakness. This is the real essence of his art; everything else was but secondary. And in this how far does he rise above Cicero! And yet who ever suffered more severely than he for his greatness? Of all political characters, Demosthenes is the most sublime and the purest<sup>o</sup> tragic

<sup>k</sup> See in particular the introduction to the Panathenaic oration, p. 234 sqq.

<sup>l</sup> ORAT. ad Philip p. 85.

<sup>m</sup> CIC. Brut c. 3. *Isoocrates, enjus domus cunctæ Græcie quasi ludus quidam patuit atque officina dicendi; magnus orator et perfectus magister.*

<sup>n</sup> CICERO in Brutus, c. 9.

<sup>o</sup> He was naturally calumniated beyond any other. Nevertheless they could bring no charge against him but his silence in the affair of Harpalus (see below), and that he was in Persian pay; which was the common charge

character, with which history is acquainted. When, still trembling with the vehement force of his language, we read his life in Plutarch; when we transfer ourselves into his times and his situation; we are carried away by a deeper interest than can be excited by any hero of the epic muse or of tragedy. From his first appearance till the moment when he swallowed poison in the temple, we see him contending against destiny, which seems to mock him with malignant cruelty. It throws him to the ground, but never subdues him. What a crowd of emotions must have struggled through his manly breast amidst this interchange of reviving and expiring hopes! How natural was it, that the lines of melancholy<sup>p</sup> and of indignation, such as we yet behold in his bust<sup>q</sup>, should have been imprinted on his severe countenance! Hardly had he passed the years of youth, when he appeared in his own behalf as accuser of his dishonest guardians<sup>r</sup>; from whom, however, he was able to rescue only a small part of his patrimony<sup>s</sup>. In his next attempts, insulted by the multitude, though encouraged by a few who anticipated his future greatness, he supported an obstinate contest with himself, till he gained the victory over his own nature<sup>t</sup>. He now appeared once more as an accuser in public prosecutions<sup>u</sup>, before he ventured to speak on the affairs of the state. But in the very first of his public speeches<sup>x</sup>

against all who did not side with Philip. If they could have proved it, is it probable that they would have kept back their proofs?

<sup>p</sup> His adversary, when he insultingly said that Demosthenes "could weep more sily than other men could laugh," *ESCHIN. in Ctesiph.* p. 597. Reisk.) uttered a deeper truth than he himself was aware of.

*VISCONTI, Iconographic, Pl. xxx.*

In the orations against ARHOMS.

*PLUTARE I, vol. iv. p. 700.*

Many stories were current on this subject; but the story of the pebbles which he put in his mouth, rests on the testimony of Demetrius Phalereus, who had heard it from the orator himself. *PLUT. vol. iv. p. 709.* The same is true of several other particulars.

<sup>q</sup> Against Androtion, Timocrates, and others. He was then twenty-seven years old. *PLUT. p. 717.*

<sup>r</sup> In the oration concerning the *ομηροποια*, or classes, delivered in the year 354 B. C. He opposed an offensive war against the Persians, for which the Athenians were ready, in the hope of effecting a general union

we see the independent statesman, who, without being dazzled by a splendid project, opposes a vast undertaking. When Philip soon after displayed his designs against Greece by his interference in the Phocian war, he for the first time came forward against that prince in his first Philippic oration<sup>y</sup>. From this period he was engaged in the great business of his life. Sometimes as counsellor, sometimes as accuser, sometimes as ambassador, he protected the independence of his country against the Macedonian policy. Splendid success seemed at first to reward his exertions. He had won a number of states for Athens<sup>z</sup>; when Philip invaded Greece, he had succeeded not only in gaining over the Thebans, but in kindling their enthusiasm<sup>a</sup>; when the day of Chæronea overthrew all his hopes<sup>b</sup>. But he courageously declares in the assembly of the people, that he still does not repent of the counsels which he had given<sup>c</sup>. An unexpected incident changes the whole aspect of things. Philip falls the victim of assassination<sup>d</sup>; and a youth, as yet but little known, is his successor. Immediately Demosthenes institutes a second alliance of the Greeks; but Alexander suddenly appears before Thebes; the terrible vengeance which he here takes, instantly destroys the league; Demosthenes, Lycurgus, and several of their supporters, are required to be delivered up; but Demades was at that time able to settle the difficulty and to appease the king<sup>e</sup>. His strength was therefore enfeebled, as Alexander departed for Asia; he begins to raise his head

of the Greeks. Here we already find the maxim, which formed the theme of his subsequent orations, as of the speeches of Chatham; viz. To stand on one's own feet.

<sup>y</sup> Spoken in the year 352 B. C.

<sup>z</sup> Achaia, Corinth, Megara, and others, PLUT. vol. iv. p. 720.

<sup>a</sup> PLUT. vol. iv. p. 722. A leading passage respecting his political conduct.

<sup>b</sup> In the year 338 B. C.

<sup>c</sup> PLUT. vol. iv. p. 726. His enemies even then endeavoured to attack him, but in vain. The people assigned to him the funeral oration on those who fell at Chæronea; and by this did honour to him and to themselves.

<sup>d</sup> In the year 336 B. C.

<sup>e</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. iv. p. 731.

once more, when Sparta attempts to throw off the yoke<sup>f</sup>; but under Antipater he is overpowered. Yet it was about this very time that, by the most celebrated of his orations, he gained the victory over the most eloquent of his adversaries; and Æschines was forced to depart from Athens<sup>g</sup>. But this seems only to have the more embittered his enemies, the leaders of the Macedonian party; and they soon found an opportunity of preparing his downfall. When Harpalus, a fugitive from the army of Alexander, came with his treasures to Athens, and the question arose, whether he could be permitted to remain there, Demosthenes was accused of having been corrupted by his money, at least to be silent<sup>h</sup>. This was sufficient to procure the imposition of a fine<sup>i</sup>; and as this was not paid, he was thrown into prison. From thence he succeeded in escaping; but to the man who lived only for his country, exile was no less an evil than imprisonment. He resided for the most part in Ægina and at Trœzen, from whence he looked with sad eyes towards the opposite shores of Attica<sup>k</sup>. Suddenly and unexpectedly a new ray of light dawned upon him. Tidings were brought that Alexander was dead<sup>l</sup>. The moment of deliverance seemed at hand; anxiety pervaded every Grecian state; the ambassadors of the Athenians passed through the cities; Demosthenes joined himself to the number, and exerted all his eloquence and power to unite them against Macedon<sup>m</sup>. In requital for such services, the people decreed his return; and years of sufferings were at last followed by a day of exalted compensation. A galley was sent to Ægina to bring back the advocate of liberty. All Athens was in

<sup>f</sup> In the year 330 B. C.

<sup>g</sup> The oration for the crown. The trial took place in the year 330 B.C.

<sup>h</sup> PLUTARCH, vol. iv. p. 733. I leave it to the reader to form an opinion respecting the anecdotes which are there related. His accuser was Dipharnachus, whose calumnious oration we still possess, OR. GR. vol. iv. REISK.

<sup>i</sup> Of fifty talents (nearly £10,000); PLUT. vol. iv. p. 735.

<sup>k</sup> PLUT. IV. 736.

<sup>l</sup> In the year 323 B. C.

<sup>m</sup> PLUT. vol. iv. p. 737.

motion; no magistrate, no priest remained in the city, when it was reported that Demosthenes was advancing from the Piræus<sup>n</sup>. Overpowered by his feelings, he extended his arms and declared himself happier than Alcibiades<sup>o</sup>; for his countrymen had recalled him, not by compulsion, but from choice. It was a momentary glimpse of the sun, which still darker clouds were soon to overshadow. Antipater and Craterus were victorious; and with them the Macedonian party at Athens; Demosthenes and his friends were numbered among the accused, and at the instigation of Demades were condemned to die. They had already withdrawn in secret from the city; but where could they find a place of refuge? Hyperides with two others fled to Ægina and took refuge in the temple of Ajax. In vain! They were torn away, dragged before Antipater, and executed. Demosthenes had escaped to the island Calauria in the vicinity of Trœzen; and taken refuge in the temple of Neptune<sup>p</sup>. It was to no purpose that Archias, the satellite of Antipater, urged him to surrender himself under promise of pardon. He pretended he wished to write something; bit the quill, and swallowed the poison contained in it. He then veiled himself, reclining his head backwards, till he felt the operation of the poison. "O Neptune!" he exclaimed, "they have defiled thy temple; but honouring thee, I will leave it while yet living." But he sank before the altar<sup>q</sup>, and a sudden death separated him from a world, which, after the fall of his country contained no happiness for him. Where shall we find a character of more grandeur and purity than that of Demosthenes?

It seemed by no means superfluous to exhibit a picture of Grecian statesmen during that period, by

<sup>n</sup> Plut. p. 738.

<sup>o</sup> Who saw a similar day of return.

<sup>p</sup> See, for the following, Plut. vol. iv. p. 741.

<sup>q</sup> What a subject for the sculptor! and yet one which has never, to my knowledge, been made use of. The artist need only draw after Plutarch.

sketching the history of the illustrious individual who holds the first rank among them. We learn from it, that the sphere in which such men acted, though they are called orators, extended far beyond their orations. From these, it is true, we chiefly derive our knowledge of them. But how differently would Demosthenes appear to us, if we were particularly acquainted with the details of his political career<sup>r</sup>. How much must have been needed to effect alliances, such as he was repeatedly able to form? What journeys, what connections, what skill in winning persons of influence, and in managing mankind?

And what were the means which these statesmen of antiquity could command, when we compare them with those of modern times? They had no orders from the cabinet to execute. They had not the wealth of nations at their disposal; they could not obtain by force what others would not voluntarily yield. Even the comparison which might be made between them and the British statesmen, is true only as far as the latter also stood in need of eloquence to confirm their influence. But the other means which Pitt could employ to form a party, were not possessed by Demosthenes. He had no presents to offer, no places to give away, no ribbons and titles to promise. On the contrary, he was opposed by men who could command everything by which avarice or ambition can be tempted. What could he oppose to them but his talents, his activity, and his courage? Provided with no other arms, he supported the contest against the superiority of foreign powers, and the still more dangerous struggle with the corruptions of his own nation. It was his high calling, to be the pillar of a sinking state. Thirty years he remained true to this cause, nor did he yield till he was buried beneath the ruins of his country.

<sup>r</sup> If the voice of history on this subject were not loud enough, this might be inferred from the calumnies of Dinarchus. It is indeed possible that Demosthenes may sometimes, in his negotiations, have been too much carried away by the liveliness of his feelings.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### INFLUENCE OF PHILOSOPHY ON THE GOVERNMENT.

THE reciprocal influence of philosophy and science and of political institutions is of a twofold nature. In the first place, the government may be the patron and promoter of such knowledge; and, secondly, the knowledge which it has thus fostered, or called into being, may have in return an effect on the government. Both these questions deserve to be considered in the case of the Greeks.

Wherever the government is actively engaged in promoting the sciences, it is certain that they have had a previous existence. To create them neither is nor can be a concern of the state. Even where they are beginning to flourish, it cannot at once be expected that they should receive public support; because they have no immediate connection with public affairs. They are the result of the investigations of eminent individuals; who have a right only to expect that no hindrances should be laid in the way of their inquiries and labours. Such was the state of things in Greece, at the time when scientific pursuits began to prevail. What inducement could the state have had to interfere at once for their encouragement? In Greece there was not the same motive which existed in the east; for the religion of the Greeks had no secret doctrines, and therefore required no institutions for teaching them. There were, no doubt, in all the principal cities, public schools for instruction in reading, writing, and music (poetry and singing); and the laws provided that no abuses dangerous to youth should prevail in them<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> See the laws of Solon on this point, PETIT. *Leg. Att.* ii. 4, p. 239.

But in most of them probably the masters were not paid by the state<sup>b</sup>; they received a compensation from their scholars. The same is true of the more advanced instruction delivered by the sophists; some of whom amassed wealth from their occupation; yet not at the expense of the state, but of their disciples.

Thus it appears, that excepting the gymnasia, which were resorted to solely for bodily exercises, and which it was a duty incumbent on citizens to support<sup>c</sup>, no institutions for the higher branches of instruction existed before the Macedonian age. But when scientific knowledge had increased and accumulated; when it was felt how valuable that knowledge was to the state; and when monarchical governments were established after the age of Alexander; provision was made for such institutions; the museums of Alexandria and Pergamus were founded; though without a more complete investigation we are still unable to decide, whether the state took no part in the formation of the schools of philosophers and rhetoricians which was now in progress. Shall the Grecian republics then still continue to be cited, as they have been by the celebrated founder of a new school of political economy, in proof that the state should leave the sciences to provide for themselves? Should it not rather encourage and provide for them in countries, where, in the several relations of life, their cultivation is necessary for its welfare? where the teacher of religion and the judge, where the physician and statesman, stand alike in need of various kinds of knowledge?

But when that assertion is understood as implying, that among the Greeks the state was wholly uncon-

<sup>b</sup> I limit the proposition intentionally, for it would be false to assert generally that this never was the case. Charondas in his laws at Catana, which were afterwards adopted at Thurium, expressly enacted that the schoolmasters should be paid by the state (Dion. xii. vol. i. p. 486.), as an affair of the utmost importance. As the schools were here so carefully attended to, may not the same have taken place in many other cities? This however is true only of the inferior or popular schools.

<sup>c</sup> The γυμνασταρχίαι; see PETIT. iii. n. 4. p. 355.

cerned about education and improvement, and abandoned them altogether to chance, a serious error is involved in the statement. No states which are noticed in the whole course of history have, in proportion to their means, done more for them than the Grecian ; but they did it in a different manner from the moderns. We measure civilization by the state of *scientific* knowledge : for which modern states, as is well known, have at different times done both so much and so little ; but in Greece the standard of national improvement was the greater or less perfection of the *arts*. The governments of Greece did little for the sciences, because they did every thing for the arts. These (as we shall more fully explain hereafter) were of more immediate importance to the community than the former ; while the reverse is true among the moderns. How then can we be astonished that the arts were the chief object of interest to the Grecian states ?

We now come to the second, and more extensive branch of our inquiry, viz. as to the influence which in the Greek states science and literature produced on the government. And here we would in the first place treat of philosophy, and to this subjoin some remarks on history.

There exist so many able and copious explanations of the Grecian philosophy, that no one will here expect a new analysis of the different systems. It is our object to show in what manner the connection between philosophy and politics originated among the Greeks, how it was continued and increased, and what was its influence.

The philosophy of the Greeks, as of other nations, began with inquiries into the origin of things. The opinions of the Ionian school on this point are generally known. If, as a modern historian has given us much reason to believe<sup>d</sup>, they were at first connected with

<sup>d</sup> BOUTERWICK, *Commentatio de primis philosophorum Gracorum decretis Physicis*, in *Comment. recent. Soc. Gött.* vol. ii.

religious notions, as we find them in the Orphic doctrines, they did not long remain thus united, for they were stripped of their mythological garb ; and in this manner the philosophy of the Greeks emancipated itself, while in the east it always remained connected with religion. But it is nowhere mentioned, that the philosophers of this school speculated on politics ; yet if we consider Anaxagoras as of the number, his connection with Pericles, and the influence which by means of his instructions, he exercised over that statesman, are remarkable ; though, as we observed in a former chapter, no instruction in any philosophical system was given, excepting in the application of some propositions in natural philosophy to practical politics. Plutarch has enabled us to ascertain their true object. "He freed Pericles," says the biographer<sup>e</sup>, "from that superstition which proceeds from false judgments respecting auguries and prodigies, by explaining to him their natural causes." He who bears in mind the great influence exercised by this belief or superstition on the undertakings of the statesmen of antiquity, will not mistake the importance of such instruction ; and he will also understand the consequences which could follow this diminution of respect for the popular religion in the eyes of the multitude. The persecution of Anaxagoras for denying the gods, and exercising his reason respecting celestial things<sup>f</sup>, could not be averted by Pericles himself, who was obliged to consent to the banishment of the philosopher. And this was the commencement of the contest between philosophy and the popular religion ; a contest which was afterwards repeatedly renewed, and was attended by farther consequences, which we will notice hereafter.

Pythagoras, though somewhat more recent than the founders of the Ionic school, was himself an Ionian of the island of Samos. Nevertheless he found his sphere

<sup>e</sup> PLUTARCH. vol. i. p. 597.

<sup>f</sup> PLUTARCH. vol. i. p. 654, 655.

of action not there, but at Croton in Lower Italy. Of no one of the Grecian sages is the history so involved in the obscurities of tradition and fable; and yet no other became of such political importance<sup>s</sup>. If we wish to estimate the political effects of his philosophy, we must distinguish the influence of the Pythagorean league on the cities of Magna Græcia, from the influence of his philosophy on Greece itself, after his league had been dissolved.

If we subject to a critical investigation the accounts extant respecting his league and its objects, we observe a phenomenon which is in many respects without a parallel. And yet I believe it was most intimately connected with the aristocratical and democratical factions which may be remarked so frequently in the Greek states. Pythagoras had fled from Samos to escape from the government of Polycrates; and whatever doubts may be raised respecting his other journeys, no one has denied his residence in Egypt. At the time when he visited that country, probably, in the reign of Amasis, who made it accessible to the Greeks, the throne of the Pharaohs was still standing, and the influence of the priests unimpaired. From them it is certain that he adopted much, in respect both of dress and manner of living; nor could it have escaped a man of his penetration, how much can be effected in a state by the union of men of influence; although he must have seen that a caste of priests could never thrive among the Greeks. From all that we hear respecting him, it is certain he was master of the art of exciting, not attention only, but enthusiasm. His dignity, his dress, the purity of his morals, his

<sup>s</sup> We cannot exactly fix the year of the birth or death of Pythagoras. It is most probable that he came to Croton about the year 540 B.C. he was certainly there at the period of the destruction of Sybaris, in 510 B.C. His society, which existed at that time, was afterwards, about 500 B.C. dissolved by Cylon and his faction. Little remains to be added to the inquiries of Meiners on the Pythagorean philosophy. Agreeably to the spirit of this work, we would only offer our view of the subject to the consideration of others.

eloquence, were of such a kind that men were inclined to exalt him above the class of common mortals<sup>b</sup>. A comparison of the history of the several cities of Magna Græcia, at the time of his first appearance, distinctly shows, that the most flourishing were governed by the higher classes. Against this order, a popular party began about this time to be formed ; and the dissensions of the two soon occasioned the destruction of Sybaris<sup>i</sup>. Pythagoras, who was anything rather than a demagogue, joined the aristocratical party, which in its turn found its support in his splendid talents. But this was the period at which luxury had risen in these cities, and especially in the rich families, to a degree never before known. It could not escape his penetration, that this corruption of manners would be followed by the downfall of his party ; and hence it was natural for him to resolve to found his political on a moral reform<sup>k</sup>. Being intimately connected with the nobles, he united them in a narrower circle ; and necessity soon occasioned a distinction to be made between the class of those who were on probation, and those who were already admitted<sup>l</sup>. Self-government was the grand object of his moral reform. For this end he found it necessary to prescribe a certain manner of life, which was distinguished by a most cleanly but not luxurious clothing, a regular diet, a methodical division of time, part of which was to be devoted to a man's own affairs, and part to the state. And this may have contributed not a little to the formation of those firm friendships, without which in republics much influence on public

<sup>b</sup> See the passages in proof of this in MEINERS, vol. i. p. 405. They are chiefly taken from Aristoxenus, one of the most credible witnesses.

<sup>i</sup> The nobles, 500 in number, fled after their banishment from thence to Croton, and prayed for protection ; which they received principally by the advice of Pythagoras, DION. xii. vol. i. p. 483. The passages which prove that those cities had aristocratical constitutions, may be found in MEINERS, vol. i. p. 396.

<sup>k</sup> See the passages in evidence of this, and the incredible sensation produced by him, in MEINERS, vol. i. p. 396.

<sup>l</sup> Accordingly, in HEROD. ii. 81. the Pythagorean doctrines are enumerated among the mysteries.

affairs cannot be acquired. His acquaintance with speculative and mathematical science need not here be mentioned, since it is not known whether he applied it to political purposes.

When we consider that his league of which he himself formed the central point, but which had its branches in the other cities of Magna Græcia, and (according to some accounts) even at Carthage and Cyrene, continued in existence for at least thirty years, we may conclude that it had real and permanent effects. His disciples came by degrees to fill the most important posts, not only at Croton, but also in other Grecian cities; and yet at the time of the destruction of Sybaris, the sect must have existed in its full force; since Pythagoras advised the reception of the exiles<sup>m</sup>; and in the war against Sybaris, one of his most distinguished scholars, the wrestler Milo<sup>n</sup>, held the supreme command. But when a secret society pursues political ends, it generally happens that an opposite party increases in the same ratio in which the preponderating influence of such an union becomes more felt<sup>o</sup>. But in this case, the opposition existed already in the popular party<sup>p</sup>. It therefore only needed a daring leader, like Cylon, to scatter the society by violence; their assembly was surprised, and most of them cut down, while a few only, and with them their master, escaped. After such a victory of the adverse faction, the expulsion of the survivors from their offices was a natural consequence, and the political importance of the society was at an end. It was never again able to raise its head.

<sup>m</sup> DIOD. I. c.

<sup>n</sup> Violent bodily exercises formed a part of the discipline of Pythagoras. At this time six prizes were, in one Olympiad, gained by inhabitants of Croton. Must not this too have contributed to increase the fame of Pythagoras?

<sup>o</sup> Need I cite the example of the Illuminati?

<sup>p</sup> Cylon, the author of that commotion, is described as the leader of the democratical party; and this is proved by the anarchy which ensued after the catastrophe, and continued till order was restored by the mother cities in Achaia.

With the political doctrines of the Pythagoreans, we are acquainted only from later writers, who are nevertheless worthy of credit, and of whom accounts and fragments have been preserved, especially in the compilations of Stobæus. "They regarded anarchy," says Aristoxenus<sup>a</sup>, "as the greatest evil; because man cannot exist without social order. They held that everything depended on the relation between the governing and the governed; that the former should be not only prudent, but mild; and that the latter should not only obey, but love their magistrates; that it was necessary to grow accustomed, even in boyhood, to regard order and harmony as beautiful and useful, disorder and confusion as hateful and injurious." From the fragments of the writings of the early Pythagoreans, as of Archytas, Diotogenes, and Hippodamus<sup>b</sup>, we perceive that they were not blindly attached to a single form of government; but only insisted that there should be no unlawful tyranny. Where a royal government existed, kings should be subject to the laws, and act only as the chief magistrates<sup>c</sup>. They regarded a mixed constitution as the best; and although they were far from desiring unlimited democracies, they as little desired unlimited aristocracies; but even where the administration resided principally in the hands of the upper class, they reserved a share of it for the people<sup>d</sup>.

Though the political agency of the society terminated with its dissolution, the Pythagorean doctrines did not become extinct. They were extended through Greece with the writings of the Pythagoreans, which were purchased at high prices; but in that country they gained political importance, only so far as they contributed to

<sup>a</sup> STON. *Serm.* xli. p. 243. This evidence is taken either from Aristoxenus, or from Aristotle himself, and therefore, according to Meiners, not to be rejected.

<sup>b</sup> Meiners considers all these writings as spurious. His reasoning, however, does not apply to the political fragments which are to be found in cap. xli. and xlivi.

<sup>c</sup> See in particular the fragments of ARCHYTAS, *Serm.* xliv. p. 314.

<sup>d</sup> Compare the fragment of DIOTOCENES, cap. xliv. p. 329.

the education of distinguished individuals. Of these, Epaminondas need only be mentioned.

In Greece, the sophists are generally considered to have been the first who applied philosophy to political science, which then became a subject of scientific instruction. Yet Plutarch, in a remarkable passage<sup>u</sup>, speaks of a political school which had been kept up at Athens from the time of Solon. "Themistocles," says he, "could not have been a pupil of Anaxagoras, as some contend. He was, however, a disciple of Mnesiphanus, who was neither an orator nor one of the physical philosophers<sup>v</sup>; but was employed on that kind of wisdom which consists in political skill and practical sagacity, and which, from the time of Solon, had been preserved as in a school." That a man like Solon should have gathered round himself a circle which he made acquainted with his thoughts and maxims, was not only natural, but was necessary for the preservation of his laws; and it was not less natural that his younger friends should in turn deliver to theirs the principles of that venerable sage. But the words of the biographer himself, show clearly that no systematic instruction was given; but principles of practical wisdom, consisting in maxims for the management of public affairs, and drawn from experience; maxims of which the few remaining poetical fragments of the lawgiver contain so valuable a store.

From this practical direction, the Greek philosophers after the times of Pythagoras entirely withdrew; and devoted themselves exclusively to metaphysical speculations. They were employed in inquiries respecting the elements and the nature of things; and came necessarily upon the question, which has so often been repeated, and which never can be answered, respecting the truth or falsehood of the perceptions of our senses. These inquiries were zealously prosecuted by

<sup>u</sup> *Life of Themistocles*, vol. i. p. 440.

<sup>v</sup> Of the Ionic and Eleatic schools.

the Eleatic school. They employed in a great measure the attention of Xenophanes, Parmenides, Heraclitus, Empedocles, and others. If, therefore, we read that some of these individuals attained to political eminence<sup>y</sup>, their philosophy was connected with their political station only so far as they thus became conspicuous; and because wise men were selected for counsellors. In one respect their philosophy had an important influence on the government; we mean in their diminishing, or attempting to diminish, the respect for the popular religion. In a country where the religion was poetical, and where philosophy had become entirely distinct from religion, the spirit of free unlimited speculation, when once awakened, could not but scrutinize the popular faith, and soon detect its weaknesses. This we hear was done by Xenophanes, who with equal boldness used bitter expressions respecting the gods, and the epic poets who had invented about the gods such indecent fables<sup>z</sup>. This collision of philosophy and the popular religion affords the most certain proof of the independence of the former; but it was also the point in which the state and philosophy came in contact, not without danger to the state, and if not to philosophy itself, yet to the philosophers.

Yet although the speculations of those reasoners were far removed from polities, the spirit of the times and necessity created many points of approach; which serve to explain the appearance of the sophists, and the part which they acted. Without regarding their peculiar doctrines, we may first mention that they were the first who gave instruction for pay. This fact implies that the want of scientific instruction began to be felt, and that, independently of such instruction, the nation had made some progress in intellectual cultiva-

<sup>y</sup> As Empedocles in Agrigentum; who is said to have refused the crown, and confirmed the liberties of the people, DIOG. LAERT. viii. 2. 9.

<sup>z</sup> DIOG. LAERT. ix. 2, 3.

tion. In other words, he who desired to become distinguished in the state, felt the necessity of improving his mind by instruction. He was obliged to learn to speak, and therefore to think; and exercises in these two things constituted the whole instruction of the sophists. Hence it was of great importance, that the minds of men should have been employed on metaphysical questions, which, as they can never be answered with certainty, are well suited for disputation, and admit of such various answers.

From the extensive inquiries which have been made respecting the sophists by modern writers<sup>a</sup>, and from the preceding remarks, it is sufficiently evident that they were the fruit of their age. It is worthy of remark, that the most celebrated of them came from very different parts of Greece; Gorgias, who begins the series, from Leontium in Sicily; Protagoras from Abdera on the coast of Thrace; Hippias from Colophon in Asia Minor; not to mention a multitude of those who were less famous. This is a remarkable proof of the general desire for knowledge which, after the Persian war, had begun to animate the Greeks. Most of those men, it is true, removed to Athens; to which place Gorgias

<sup>a</sup> Yet even after all that has here been done by Meiners, Tennemann, and others, many things remain obscure; for the explanation of which the foundation must be laid in a more accurate chronology of the sophists. The learned Dissertation of GEEL, *Historia critica Sophistarum, qui Socratis aetate Athenis flourerunt, in the nova acta literariorum Societatis Rheno-Traiectinae*, 1823, refers chiefly to the age of Socrates, but it also explains the distinction between Rhetors and Sophists, as well as the cause of the appearance of the latter. Even the sophists before the Macedonian times (of a later period we here make no mention) did not continue the same; and we should do Gorgias and Protagoras great injustice, were we to place them in the same rank with those against whom the aged ISOCRATES in his Panathenaic oration, p. 236, and *De Sophistis*, p. 293, makes such bitter complaints. Gorgias, Protagoras, and Hippias are commonly called the early sophists; of whom Gorgias is said to have come to Athens, 427 B. C. as ambassador, although this is not mentioned by Thucydides. But it is evident from Aristophanes, who brought his *Clouds* upon the stage, for the first time, 424 B. C. that at that epoch the sophists had already been long established at Athens. It appears that the great celebrity and wealth of the sophists commenced in the times of Gorgias and the following age. In the *Clouds*, Socrates and his pupils are represented as not only not rich, but so poor that they do not know how they are to subsist from one day to another.

was sent as ambassador during the Peloponnesian war; because that city, so long as it held the first rank, opened the widest and most profitable theatre for their exertions; but they also often travelled through the cities of Greece in the train of their pupils, met with the kindest reception, and were employed as counsellors in public affairs, and not unfrequently as ambassadors. They gave, though at a high price, to all young men who resorted to them, instruction in every branch of knowledge deemed essential to their education. This undoubtedly occasioned that boasting of universal knowledge with which they have been charged; it should, however, be remembered, that in those days the number and extent of the sciences were still very limited.

The sophists at first embraced in their course of instruction, philosophy as well as rhetoric. But that which they called philosophy, was, as with the scholastic philosophers, the art of confounding an opponent by syllogisms and sophisms; and the subjects about which they were most fond of speculating, were some of those metaphysical questions, respecting which we ought to learn, that we never can know anything. This kind of reasoning, when disputation and speaking were taught, was very closely connected with rhetoric. Afterwards the sophists and rhetoricians formed distinct classes; but the different classes which Isocrates distinguished in his old age<sup>b</sup> could hardly have been so decidedly marked in his youth.

The precepts and the very name of the sophists became odious even among the ancients; and it would be vain to attempt to free them entirely from the reproaches cast on them by philosophers and by the comic poets. But yet they cannot be deprived of the glory of having shown the necessity of a liberal education for the higher classes of their nation. They rose ra-

<sup>b</sup> ISOCRATES, p. 293 sqq.

pidly and extraordinarily, because they were closely connected with the wants of the times. In states where all subjects were discussed orally, and where everything was just beginning to improve, instructors in logic and rhetoric could not but be acceptable. But in two respects, by reducing eloquence to a mere art of disputing, and by degrading or ridiculing the popular religion, they soon became injurious, and even dangerous, to the state.

The first seems to have been a very natural consequence of the condition of science at that time. The more limited is men's knowledge, the more bold are they in their assertions ; the less they know, the more they believe that they do and can know. Man persuades himself of nothing more readily, than that he has arrived at the bounds of human knowledge. This belief creates in him a dogmatical spirit ; because he believes he can prove everything. But where it is believed that everything can be proved, there naturally arises the art of proving the contrary proposition ; and to this the art of disputing degenerated among the sophists. The art of confounding right and wrong, objected to them by the comic poets, may have had a very injurious influence on social life ; but a greater evil resulting from it was the destruction of a nice sense of truth ; for even truth itself becomes contemptible, when it is believed that it can as well be refuted as established by argument.

Their contempt for the popular religion was probably a consequence of the intimate connection which existed between the first sophists, and their predecessors and contemporaries, the philosophers of the Eleatic school. In these accusations injustice has perhaps been done to some of them ; for it may be doubted whether Protagoras deserved the name of atheist<sup>c</sup> : yet no circum-

<sup>c</sup> He had only said he knew not whether the gods existed or not ; yet for this he was banished from Athens, and his writings burnt, *Sext. Emp.* ix. 57. That the atheism of Prodicus is uncertain has been observed by TENNEMANN, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. i. p. 377.

stance probably contributed so much to make them odious in the eyes of the people.

If to these things we add their lax moral principles, which consisted in lessons of prudence, how life could be made easy and be enjoyed, but which, doubtless, assisted in procuring for them pupils and followers, we can discern the whole nature of the evil influence which they exercised. And yet these very aberrations of the human understanding may have been necessary to awaken the minds which were to point out better paths.

The son of Sophroniscus is the first among these. He began the opposition to the sophists. As Philip called forth a Demosthenes, so the sophists produced a Socrates. After all that antiquity has left us concerning him, and all the inquiries of modern historians, he is one of the characters most difficult to be understood, and stands by himself, not only in his own nation, but in the whole history of the civilization of our race. For what sage, who was neither a public teacher, nor a writer, nor a religious reformer, has exercised such an influence on his own age and on posterity ; We willingly admit that his influence has far exceeded his own expectations and designs. These hardly had reference to posterity. Everything seems to indicate that they were calculated for his contemporaries alone. But it may with justice be remarked, that this only increases the difficulty of an explanation. For who will not ask, How could this man, without intending it, have produced an influence on all succeeding ages ? The chief reason is to be found in the nature of his philosophy ; though he was partly assisted by external circumstances.

After the many writings upon his philosophy, it would be superfluous to delineate it anew. It made its way because it immediately related to matters of the highest interest to man. While the sophists were brooding over mere speculations, and their contests

were only contests of words, Socrates taught those who came near him to look into themselves; man and his relations with the world were the objects of his investigation. That we may not repeat what has already been so well remarked by others, we will here allow ourselves only some general observations respecting the philosopher himself and his career.

His influence was most closely connected with the forms of social life at Athens; in a country where these are not the same, a second Socrates could never equal the first in the extent of his influence. He gave instruction neither in his house nor in any fixed place; the public squares and porches were the favourite scenes of his conversations. For such instruction, a proper audience can be found only in a nation in which private was much mixed with public life. This was the case with the Athenians. Such a method of teaching could be effectual among them, because they were not only accustomed to pass a large portion of the day in places of public resort, but also to discuss almost every subject which could occur. It was here that the sophists passed much of their time, not in giving formal instruction, which, as it was paid for, was given in a definite place, but (as Plato remarks of them) in order to acquire rich young men as pupils. The war which Socrates had once for all declared against them, made him seek most frequently to pass his time where he could expect to find his adversaries, as well as his friends and followers<sup>d</sup>.

His mode of teaching was no less important. It was by conversation, not by continued discourse. He had therefore adopted the very manner which is most suit-

<sup>d</sup> From this point of resemblance, I think we may explain how Aristophanes could confound Socrates with the sophists. He represents him as giving instruction for money, and in a house of his own, appropriated to study (*φροντιστήριον*); and these two circumstances are true of the sophists, but not of Socrates. I can therefore discover in his Socrates nothing but the representative of the sophists. To be sure, the comic poet would have better provided for his reputation with posterity, if he had brought a Prodicus or Gorgias upon the stage instead of Socrates.

able to public places. But in two respects his conversation, apart from the matter it contained, was distinguished from the common intercourse of life. The one was the irony which he introduced, especially in his attacks on the sophists; the other, and the more important, was the conviction which he often expressed, that he spoke from the impulse of divine power. Socrates differs from the whole class of men whom we include under the name of prophets; for while these appear as the immediate envoys and messengers of the Divinity, he only occasionally insinuated his claim to this character, although he never denied it. He neither desired to found a new religion, nor to improve the existing one, which would necessarily be the object of a prophet. The appearance of Socrates was therefore the noblest result of the separation of philosophy from religion, a merit belonging solely to the Greeks; in no eastern nation could a Socrates have produced any effect.

He became, however, a martyr to his doctrines. It would be superfluous to prove anew the groundlessness of the charges, that he denied the popular religion, and was a corrupter of the youth<sup>e</sup>. But we will not neglect to observe, that by his death he produced even more important consequences than by his life. If he had been snatched away by sickness, who knows whether he would have been remembered more than other meritorious instructors? His friends and pupils would have spoken of him with respect, but hardly with enthusiasm. The poisoned cup ensured him immortality. By his death, in connection with his doctrines, he exhibited in reality one of those sublime ideal conceptions in which the Grecian nation alone is so fertile; he presented what till then had been wanting, the image of a philosopher who dies for his principles.

<sup>e</sup> Besides the works on the history of philosophy, see Tycsen's *Essay on the Accusation of Socrates*, in the *Bibliothek der alten Litteratur und Kunst*, parts I. and II.

The philosophy of Socrates had no immediate connection with politics. Its object was man, considered as a moral being, not as a citizen. Hence it was indirectly of the more importance to the state; since it was nothing less than an attempt to avert the ruin with which the state was threatened by a false philosophy. This object was not fully attained; but must the blame of it be attributed to Socrates?

From his school, or rather from his friends, a number of distinguished minds were produced, of whom some differed from each other in opinions and systems as widely as possible. This could only have happened because Socrates had no system, and hence laid no chains on the spirit of inquiry. He only wished to excite the minds of others; and hence we perceive how there could have been among his associates, an Antisthenes who made self-denial, and an Aristippus who made pleasure, the basis of morality; a Pyrrho, whose object it was to doubt, and an Euclid, who sought to demonstrate. As the philosophy of these men was in no degree connected with polities, we pass over them, that we may not leave unmentioned the greatest of all the pupils of Socrates.

To comprehend the character of Plato, a genius would be required hardly inferior to his own. Common, or even uncommon, philosophical acumen, industry, and learning, are not here sufficient. The mind of Plato rose above visible objects, and entered the higher regions, where exist the eternal first forms of things. To these his eye was undeviatingly directed, as the only regions where knowledge can be found, since there exists nothing beyond opinion in the world of the senses,—and where real beauty, goodness, and justice, dwell eternal and unchangeable as the Divinity, and yet distinct from the Divinity. He who cannot follow Plato to those regions, and feel with him in the veil of mythological fables, what he himself felt rather than knew, may make many valuable and correct re-

marks respecting that philosopher, but is not capable of presenting a perfect and adequate image of him. The attempt to give a body to that which is ethereal, is vain; for it then ceases to be ethereal. But the relation in which he stood to his nation can be very distinctly delineated. In him the poetical character of the Greeks expressed itself philosophically. It was only in a nation so thoroughly poetical, that a Plato could be produced.

Socrates had contemplated man as a moral being; Plato's philosophy embraced the social union. Long before his time political science had so far become an object of speculation, that writers had endeavoured to sketch the model of a perfect constitution. The number of the Greek republics, the imperfection of their governments, and the freedom of discussion, almost necessarily conducted the reflecting mind to such subjects of thought. The first attempt of this kind, as we learn from Aristotle<sup>f</sup>, was made by Hippodamus of Miletus, who must have been a contemporary of Themistocles<sup>g</sup>. The separation of the three classes of artisans, agriculturists, and soldiers; and the division of land into sacred, public, and private, remind us of the Egyptian institutions. Not only his plan, but that of Phaneas of Chalcedon, is discussed at large by Aristotle. Soon afterwards, forms of government and systems of legislation, became subjects of frequent discussion; but these inquiries could not have had much practical influence, since the days were passed in which new lawgivers could appear in Greece. Of many works composed in those times, we only possess the two treatises of Plato. These, especially the Republic, are intelligible only to those who comprehend and bear always in mind, that the Greeks regarded a state as a moral agent, which governs itself, and cannot be

<sup>f</sup> *Aristot. Polit.* ii. 8.

<sup>g</sup> According to Aristotle, he was employed in the construction of the Piraeus, which was the work of Themistocles.

swayed by any impulse from a higher power, nor be governed by another<sup>b</sup>. Then it is no longer difficult to explain the close and indissoluble union between morals and politics, a union which modern writers have so frequently called in question.

During the days of the freedom of Greece, almost every important question connected with theoretical or practical philosophy was made the object of inquiry and discussion. Later writers may perhaps have expounded them differently and with greater acuteness; but to the earliest belongs the great merit of having presented to the reflecting mind, the objects to which it should direct its exertions. From a comparison of the earlier and later systems of the Grecian philosophy, it is known that the Stoic system was allied to the Cynic, the Epicurean to the Cyrenaic, that of the later sceptics to that of Pyrrho and the Eleatic school,—these subjects, however, we leave to be explained by some writer who is capable of giving, not a voluminous, but a succinct and spirited account of philosophical speculation among the Greeks.

If the influence of philosophy on political institutions must be estimated by its reaction on them, the reverse is in some measure true of the science of history. This is connected with polities, inasmuch as it is the result of the changes and destinies of the state. It is true that history was not long confined among the Greeks to that of their own nation. As there was free intercourse with foreigners, accounts and traditions respecting their origin, manners, and revolutions, became common. But everything proceeded from the history of their native country; this always remained the central point. And here again we perceive the just views of the Greeks. Is not each nation the most important object of consideration to itself? And next

<sup>b</sup> See the excellent treatise of J. L. G. DE GEER, *Diatribe in Politicas Platonicas Principia*. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1810.

to its present, what can interest it more than its previous condition?

This was early and very generally felt; and if historical accounts have been but scantily, or not at all preserved, the fault is to be attributed, not to the want of exertions to ensure that end, but to the imperfect means which mankind could then command; that is, not merely to the want of an alphabet, but of the materials necessary for writing. Persepolis, Thebes, Mexico—do not all these furnish convincing proofs of the truth of our remark?

Much also depended on the circumstance, whether any persons forming a peculiar class or caste in the nation, were employed to record the events as they passed. Where a priesthood existed, the preparing of the calendar, whether more or less perfect, was a part of their duty; and to this it was easy to add the writing of annals.

The Greeks had no such separate order of priests; and hence we hear nothing of any annals which they possessed<sup>1</sup>. Yet religion did something for history. Many traditional accounts, preserving the memory of early events, were associated with the offerings consecrated in the temples. How often are these referred to by Herodotus? and the historical remarks of Pausanias are almost always made in connection with them. But they could not fix a succession of time, nor do more than confirm single facts.

The history, therefore, of the Greeks emanated from an entirely different source, from tradition; and since this supplied poetry with its subjects, the poets remained for centuries the sole preservers of traditional accounts. But it does not follow that Grecian history was an invention because it was originally poetical.

<sup>1</sup> Where a sort of hereditary priesthood existed, as at Sicyon, from the earliest times, a sort of annals was connected with it. They seem, however, to have consisted chiefly in an enumeration of the succession of priests, and therefore hardly deserve the name.

Indeed it never entirely lost that character. The subjects of history, as presented by tradition, were only interwoven with fictions. But it is obvious that the character of the Grecian traditions must have had a great, or even a decisive, influence on the character of their history.

By means of the original and continued division of the nation into many races, the traditions were greatly multiplied. Each tribe had its heroes and its deeds of valour to employ the bard. To convince ourselves of this, we need but cast a glance on the tales of the Grecian heroes. Individuals among them who were more distinguished than the rest, as Hercules and Jason, became the heroes of the nation, and therefore the favourites of the poets. And after the first great national enterprise, after Troy had fallen, need we be astonished that the muse of history preferred this to all other subjects?

All this is too well known to need more detailed exposition<sup>k</sup>. But much as Homer and the cyclic poets eclipsed the succeeding ones, historical poetry kept pace with the political improvement of the nation. This union we must not leave unobserved.

That advancement in political knowledge was, as we observed above, connected with the rising prosperity of the cities in Greece and of the colonies. The founding of cities therefore formed a great part of the early history, (*κτίσεις*). But cities were founded by heroes; and the legends respecting them were therefore intimately connected with other traditions. Who does not see how wide a field was here opened for historical poetry? Such narrations had always a lasting interest for the inhabitants; they were, by their very nature, likely to be exaggerated till they became marvellous; and were connected with accounts of the most ancient voyages; stories of the wonders of foreign and distant

<sup>k</sup> See HEYSE, *Historia scribenda inter Graecos primordia*, Comment. <sup>8vo.</sup> &c., Gotting, vol. xiv.

countries ; the island of the Cyclops, the garden of the Hesperides, the wealthy Iberia, etc. What could afford more agreeable nourishment to the imagination of a youthful people ? What could be more attractive to the poets ?

Hence there arose among the Greeks a particular class of historical poems, which celebrated the founding of cities ; although both in subject and form, they were in the closest union and alliance with other poems. They embraced, it is true, the cities of the mother country<sup>1</sup> ; but applied chiefly to the colonies, the foundations of which, as being connected with the exploits of heroes, offered copious materials for poetry.

History continued to be treated in a poetical manner, till near the time of the Persian war. How deeply, therefore, must the poetical character have been imprinted upon Grecian history ? And even when the first historians appeared who wrote in prose, this character was changed in the form, rather than in the matter. They related in prose what the poets had told in verse. This is expressly stated by Strabo<sup>m</sup>. "The earliest writers," says he, "Calmus of Miletus, Pherecydes, Hecataeus, preserved the poetical character, though not the measure of verse. Those who came after them were the first to descend from that height to the present style of writing." The opinion of Cicero seems therefore to have been ill founded, when he compares the most ancient historians, and particularly Pherecydes, with the earliest annalists of the Romans, Fabius Pictor and Cato<sup>n</sup>, whose style was certainly unpoetical.

<sup>1</sup> Especially Athens, as the Atticides were at a later period probably taken from these poems. Other cities also were included, as Corinth, whose early history was celebrated by Eumelus in his poem called *Corinthiaca* ; (see *Bibliothek der alten Litteratur und Kunst*, xi. p. 94). Of the colonies I will only mention Cyrene ; the account of whose foundation in Herodotus doubtless was derived from a poetical source. Many similar narrations in Pausanias also betray the same origin.

<sup>m</sup> STRABO, i. p. 34.

<sup>n</sup> CICERO de Oratore, ii. 12

The larger number, and the earliest of these writers of legends<sup>o</sup>, as Herodotus styles them in opposition to the epic poets, were Ionians. In the very countries where epic poetry had been most successfully cultivated, it gave birth to narration in prose. History has left us in uncertainty respecting the precise causes of this change; but has not the east always been the land of fables? Here, where the crowd of colonies was springing up, which were founded towards the end of the heroic age, that class of narrations which relate to these subjects, found the most appropriate themes. In explaining, therefore, the origin of historical writing among the Greeks, it may perhaps be proper to remember, that they participated in the character of the oriental nations; although they merit the glory of having subsequently given to that study its true and proper character.

But in the period in which the prose style of narration was thus forming, the improvement of history appears to have been promoted by several other causes. The most celebrated of the legendary historians lived and flourished in the latter half of the sixth century before the Christian era; that is, not long before the Persian war<sup>p</sup>. Of these the earliest are said to have been Cadmus and Hecataeus of Miletus, Acusilaus of Argos, Pherecydes of Syros, Charon of Lampsacus, and several others enumerated by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. They belong to the age in which the nation was growing in youthful energy; when it was already extended to the west and the east, and its flourishing cities were engaged in active commerce; when it had become acquainted with many nations, and travelling had begun to be common. From the titles of the works of these narrators of traditions, it is evident that they were not content to limit themselves to the ac-

<sup>o</sup> οἱ λογογράφοι, as Hecataeus and others.

<sup>p</sup> Between the 60th and 70th Olympiads, or 540 - 500 B. C.

counts which they found in the ancient epic poets; but that they took a wider range, embracing the history of cities and nations, and also the description of different coasts. A proof of this is found in the catalogue of the writings of Hellanicus the Lesbian, one of the latest of them<sup>q</sup>.

These remarks will serve to show us the character of history before the time of Herodotus. It was in its origin entirely Grecian; and even when its sphere of observation was extended to foreign countries, kept pace with the political advancement of Greece. It preserved its poetical character, and therefore did not become critical; but it was developed with perfect freedom; and was never held by the priests in subserviency to religion. As poetry had for a long time been the means of its preservation, it was in some measure the work of imagination (although epic poetry was much more restricted than the lyric and tragic, which succeeded it); but in return, as it was never communicated to the public by hieroglyphics, it could not, as in Egypt, degenerate into mere symbolical narration. When it came to be transferred from poetry to prose, it was necessarily connected with the improvements in the art of writing; and the deficiency of our information on this point<sup>r</sup> is one of the chief reasons why we are so little able to mark the progress of its particular branches. But whatever influence these causes may have exercised, the great cause which retarded the progress of historical composition before Herodotus, consisted in the *want of subjects*.

Before the Persian war, there was no subject capable of inspiring the historian. The Trojan war, the Argonautic expedition, all the great undertakings, be-

<sup>q</sup> See CREUZER's work on the Origin and Progress of History in Greece. *Die historische Kunst der Griechen in ihrer Entstehung und Fortbildung*, p. 80. And compare the account of the early historians, or *λογογράφοι*, in DAHLMANN's *Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der Geschichte*, p. 103, especially concerning Hecataeus.

<sup>r</sup> See WOLFF *Prolegom.* p. 40 seq.

longed to tradition, and hence were more than half included within the province of poetry. The narrations of the origin of cities, accounts of distant nations and countries, might gratify curiosity, might afford amusement, but could do no more. There existed no great national theme of universal interest.

At length came the Persian war. The victory at Marathon first awakened the spirit of the Greeks; whether this was more inflamed by the defeat at Thermopylæ, or the victory at Salamis, is difficult to say; by the battle of Plataæ freedom was saved.

This subject, from its very nature, belonged exclusively to history; and poetry had no share in it. It was no subject of remote antiquity, nor yet of the present moment; but of a period which had but recently passed away. And yet it came so frequently in contact with tradition, that a historian, in a critical age, would often have been compelled to wander into the regions of mythology. How much more, then, at a time when the bounds between history and tradition had not yet been in the slightest degree defined?

Herodotus employed himself on this subject, and managed it in a manner which surpassed all expectation\*. Many things, it is true, served to facilitate his labour. Many attempts had been made to explain the

\* For a critical inquiry into the life of Herodotus see DAHLMANN'S *Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der Geschichte*, vol. ii. Among the most doubtful points in his life, are the dates of the composition and publication of his history. Doubtless, in its present form it is no juvenile work; but it seems to me highly improbable that Herodotus did not begin to write it till after his seventy-seventh year. The mention of single events as low down as 408 B. C. collected by Dahlmann, proves only that he had not at that time, *published* or *completed* his work, not that he had not begun to write it. Moreover of the two events referred to this year, one, viz., the death of Amyntas, is placed by Syncellus (confirmed by the Attic edition of Eusebius) 8 years earlier, that is, 416 B. C., and if the Darius named in i. 130, is Darius Nothus, it is singular that he should be mentioned without any more precise description. The most probable supposition therefore is, that Herodotus, while a young man, collected the materials for his work on his travels, and composed it after his settlement at Thurium, 441 B. C. at a mature age: but did not publish it till near the close of his life. It cannot be doubted that he had early conceived the design of composing such a work, and that he had travelled for that purpose. But when he came to digest his materials, he would doubtless

earliest history of cities and nations ; travelling had been rendered easy by the extensive commerce of the Grecian cities, and several of his predecessors are known to have visited many countries<sup>1</sup>; the writers of legends or logographers had already fitted the language for prose narration ; and the nation for which he wrote had formed a taste for historical composition. Yet he was the first who undertook to treat of a purely historical subject ; and thus to take the decisive step which gave to history its rank as an independent branch of composition. He did not indeed limit himself to his chief subject, but gave it such an extent, that his work, notwithstanding its epic unity, became in a certain sense a universal history<sup>2</sup>. While he brought down the thread of his story from the times when disputes first arose between the Greeks and the barbarians, to the glorious termination of the war at Platææ, and the liberation of Greece from its invaders, he constantly either found or made opportunities of interweaving the description and history of the countries and nations which he was led to mention ; without however losing sight of his chief object, to which he returns from every episode. He had himself visited the greater part of these countries and nations ; had seen them with his own eyes ; had collected information from the most credible sources. But when he enters upon their antiquities, especially of his own nation, he makes use of the means afforded him by his age ; and here his work borders on those of the logographers. It is no longer necessary to appear as his defender ; posterity has not continued unjust towards him. No writer has received more frequent confirmation by the advances which, of late years, have been made in the science of geography, than Herodotus,

often find occasion to make fresh inquiries and to collect additional information ; and on the whole his work is of such a magnitude as might employ even a long life. [On the latest event mentioned in the history of Herodotus, see CLINTON, *Fas., Hist.*, part ii. p. 79. 409 E. C.]

<sup>1</sup> As Hecataeus and Pherecydes.

<sup>2</sup> Only the history of the Assyrians he reserved for a separate work, i. 16.

who was formerly so often the object of ridicule. But our sole purpose was to show in what manner history had been elevated by his choice of a subject; and how this choice was intimately connected with the impulse given to the political character of his nation.

The first great step had thus been taken. A purely historical subject, relating to a former but not a distant period, and not handed down by tradition, had been treated by a master, who had devoted the larger part of his life to a plan, framed with deliberation, and executed with enthusiasm. Greece possessed an historical work, which first showed what history should be; and which was peculiarly well fitted to awaken a taste for it. As Herodotus read his work to all Greece assembled at Olympia, a youth, according to the tradition<sup>u</sup>, was incited by it to become, not his imitator, but his successor.

Thucydides appeared. His predecessor had written a history of the past. He became the historian of his own time. He was the first who seized on this idea, which is the distinguishing character of his work; though others, especially the ancient critics, sought for it in his style, his eloquence, and other secondary matters. By this means he placed historical compo-

<sup>u</sup> This tradition about Thucydides listening to the history of Herodotus, when recited at the Olympic games, has been so conclusively disproved by DAHLMANN, *ibid.* p. 20. and 216, that it is superfluous to add, that if Thucydides was present at the age of sixteen, when Herodotus read his history in 456 B. C., he must have formed his project of writing a history at least 32 years before he executed it, since according to the testimony of his biographer Matellinus, he did not begin to compose it till his exile, which began in 424 B. C. It is however to be observed, with respect to the recitation of Herodotus at Olympia, that Lucian's account does not fix any time: the supposition that it took place in 456 B. C. rests only on the anecdote about Thucydides, which Lucian does not mention. Perhaps therefore it might have occurred at a later period. It is not probable that Lucian should have invented the story; but highly probable that he may have embellished it. Doubtless recitations of this kind (*επωειδεῖς*) took place not before the whole people, but before a smaller number of persons, who were interested in the subject: and if Herodotus read not his whole work, but a part of it (and probably it was composed piece-meal), many of the difficulties which Dahlmann finds in the narrative would disappear. I make these remarks, not in order to assert the truth of the story, but only to show that its most obvious improbabilities can be easily explained away.

sition on a new footing, and elevated it far more than perhaps even himself was aware. His subject made him necessarily a critic.

The convulsion produced by the Persian war had been terrific, but transitory. During its continuance no historian could appear. It was not till after its fury had for some time abated, and men had regained their composure of mind, that Herodotus could obtain attention. Amidst the splendour of the victories which had been gained, under the shade of security won by valour,—with what emotions did the Greek look back upon those years? Who could be more welcome to him than the historian, who painted for him this picture of his own glory, not only as a whole, but in its parts? The age of Thucydides, on the contrary, was full of grandeur, but of difficulties. In their long and obstinate struggle, the Grecian states sought to overturn each other from their very foundations. It was not the age of wars only, but of revolutions, with all their horrors. Whether a man were an aristocrat or democrat, a friend of Athens or of Sparta, was the question on which depended fortune, liberty, and life. A fortunate reverse rescued Thucydides from the peril with which he was encircled; and gave him that immortality which the capture of Amphipolis never would have conferred on him<sup>x</sup>. The fruit of his leisure was the history of his own times; a work which he himself proposed to write, and actually did write, for all future ages<sup>y</sup>.

This is not the place to eulogize the man, who remained calm amidst all the conflict of contending passions, the only exile that has written an impartial history. His acquaintance with public affairs, his

<sup>x</sup> After Amphipolis had been taken by Brasidas, Thucydides was accused of having come too late to the assistance of that city, and was banished by the Athenian people: he actually passed twenty years in exile at Thrace, where he possessed valuable mines. See THUCYDIDES himself on this subject, iv. 104, and v. 26.

<sup>y</sup> *Krause's Hist. Thucyd.* i. 22.

political sagacity, his nervous, though occasionally uncouth, style, have all been illustrated by others. We will only allow ourselves to show, by a few remarks, how much the science of historical composition was advanced by the nature of his undertaking.

The work of the man who was the first to write a history of his own times, and of events in which he himself had a share, must not be compared with that of the modern writer, who compiles it from numerous written documents. He was compelled to ascertain everything by personal inquiry; and that, too, at a period when everything was misrepresented by passion and party spirit. But antiquity had not enveloped his subject in the veil of tradition, nor had it in its nature any epic interest. The subject was thoroughly prosaic; setting before the writer no other aim than that of exhibiting the truth. In this lay the sole interest: and to ascertain and repeat the truth, is all that can be fairly demanded of the historian. We honour and respect him, because, penetrated with the consciousness of his dignity, he never for a moment relaxes from it. A sentiment of reverence accompanies us from the first to the last page of his work. Not the historian, History herself seems to address us.

But to what new views must he have been led, when, with the desire of arriving at truth, he turned his eyes to the form under which history had hitherto appeared? It was his immediate aim to relate the events of his own times; but the preceding age could not remain wholly excluded from the sphere of his observation. It appeared to him clothed in the mantle of tradition; and he who scrutinized everything with care, was not caught by its delusive splendour. He endeavoured to contemplate antiquity as it was, to take from it the false glare which had been thrown over it, leaving nothing but the light of truth; and thus was produced that invaluable introduction which precedes his work.

By such means Thucydides was the inventor of an

art, which before him had been almost unknown, the art of historical criticism; without being fully conscious of the great value of his discovery. For he did not apply it to all branches of knowledge, but only to his subject, because it was a natural consequence of that subject. The muse of history had made him acquainted with the hidden secrets of her science; no one before or after him has drawn the line more clearly between history and tradition. And what is this, but to draw the distinction between the principle on which history was composed in the east and west? and in this the whole consisted. For to repeat a remark which has already been cursorily made, the great difference between the two consists in this; in the west, the free spirit of criticism was developed, and in the east never.

It is therefore just to say, that Thucydides advanced with a giant's step. It is just to say, that he rose above his age; neither his own nor the following could reach him. Poetical tradition was too deeply interwoven with Grecian history to admit of an entire separation. Theopompos and Ephorus, whenever the heroic age was to be discussed, drew their materials with as little concern from the mythographers and the poets, as if Thucydides had never written.

A third step yet remained to be taken; and it was in some respects the most dangerous of all; to become the historian of one's own exploits. This step was taken by Xenophon. For when we speak of his historical writings, his *Anabasis* so far surpasses the rest, that it alone deserves to be mentioned. But this new step may with propriety be called one of the most important. Would that he who ventured to take it, had found many successors! By the mildness and modesty of his personal character, Xenophon was secured from the faults into which men are so apt to fall when they describe their own actions; although these virtues, and the nature of his subject, could not give his work those

superior qualities which the genius of Cæsar enabled him to impart to his Commentaries.

Thus, in the period of their freedom, all the principal kinds of history were developed among the Greeks. Afterwards, they can hardly be said to have made any progress, although the subjects of history grew more various and more extensive with the enlarged sphere of politics in the Macedonian and Roman age; and the idea of a philosophical and universal history was developed by Polybius and his continuator Posidonius. But after the downfall of liberty, when rhetoric became prevalent and was applied to history, the higher kind of criticism ceased to be employed in it. The style, the manner in which a subject was treated, were then regarded; not the subject itself. The essence was forgotten in disputes about the form. We have abundant proofs of this in the writings of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who has, nevertheless, been usually considered the first of these critics.

## CHAPTER XV.

### INFLUENCE OF POETRY ON THE GOVERNMENT.

WHETHER in our inquiries respecting the political institutions of Greece, their poetry and arts should be considered, will hardly be doubted by any of my readers. Almost every one of the preceding chapters has served to show how closely they were connected with the state. Yet our remarks must be confined to the examination of this question: What was the nature, and what were the consequences, of this connection? But even in answering this we might be carried very far, if we were to pass the bounds which the character of this work prescribes. In speaking of poetry, we would principally consider the dramatic; since we have already spoken of the epic. But the drama can hardly be discussed, separately from lyric poetry. We place the arts in immediate connection with poetry, because nature herself had united them among the Greeks; among whom the arts are, as it were, the key to poetry. The remark of a modern critic<sup>a</sup> is perfectly true, that the masterpieces of sculpture furnish the best commentary on the tragedians. Although the persons are not always the same whom the poets and the sculptors bring before us, we yet form from them our conceptions of the ideal forms. He who has seen the sublime figures of the Niobe and the Laocoön, can easily represent to his mind an Electra or an Oedipus in the forms under which they floated before the mind of the poet.

With the advancing refinement and civilization of

<sup>a</sup> A. W. SCHLEGEL, on Dramatic Literature, *über dramatische Kunst und Litteratur*, vol. i. p. 67.

Greece, the connection between the state, and poetry and the arts, proportionably increased ; and it was therefore most intimate at its most flourishing period. Even the earliest lawgivers of the Greeks regarded poetry as the chief means not only of forming the character of youth, but of exercising an influence on their riper years. But in an age when there was as yet no literature, poetry could not be separate from song ; and it was commonly accompanied with an instrument. From this practice the word music derived its meaning, which embraced all this together. Yet this is chiefly true of lyric poetry, which, as the very immediate expression of the feelings of the poet, was much more closely connected with song than the epic. If we bear constantly in mind the principal idea which the Greeks had framed of a state, that as a moral agent it was to govern itself, we can comprehend the whole importance which music, in the wider sense of the word, possessed in the eyes of the Grecian lawgivers. It seemed to them in that age, when as yet the mind had received no philosophical instruction, when the feelings, and the management of the feelings, were of the greatest importance, to be the best means of influencing them ; and we need not be astonished, when we read in Plutarch<sup>b</sup> and other writers, of the great severity with which the laws, especially at Sparta, insisted on the preservation of the ancient music, and the established tunes. It may be difficult in our days, when music is no longer regarded as a political engine<sup>c</sup>, to form any distinct idea of those institutions of the ancients. But as human nature is never untrue to itself, institutions which are founded on it are always, to a certain extent, and under certain forms, preserved. In the nineteenth century, in which there is no longer any danger of corrupting a nation by changes in music,

<sup>b</sup> In his essay, *De Musica*, vol. ii. p. 1131.

<sup>c</sup> That in his times, when music was used only in the theatres, it had lost its ancient application, is the complaint of PLUTARCH, ii. 1140.

(although it would be very presumptuous to give a hasty opinion on its influence and effects,) no regiment is raised without its band; and the commander who, instead of a warlike march, should order a dirge to be played, would justly incur the same reproaches with him who in ancient days made an unseasonable use of the Lydian instead of the Dorian measure.

Lyric poetry was moreover intimately connected with the popular religion, or was in fact a result of it; for hymns in praise of the gods are mentioned among its earliest productions<sup>d</sup>. It was therefore important to the state as a support of the popular religion, particularly by contributing to the splendour of the festivals. For when was a festival celebrated by the Greeks and the songs of the poets not heard? But they received their greatest importance from the institution of choral songs. These choruses, even independent of the drama, were the chief ornament of the festivals, and were composed of persons of various ages. There were those of youths, of men, and of the aged; which replied to each other alternately in song<sup>e</sup>. As the festivals were a public concern, so too were the choruses; and we have no reason to be surprised that the maintenance of them should have formed a part of the civil burthens.

The choral song at the festivals was as ancient as the heroic age, or at least as the time of Homer<sup>f</sup>. Although it was capable of receiving the highest ornaments, and did actually receive them, it did not necessarily require any great preparations. The similar spectacles which modern travellers have witnessed in the islands of the South sea, especially the Society

<sup>d</sup> "Music," says PLUTARCH, ii. p. 1140, "was first made use of in the temples and sacred places in praise of the gods, and for the instruction of youth, long before it was introduced into the theatres, which at that time were not in existence."

<sup>e</sup> See in particular the whole oration of Demosthenes against Midias, who had insulted Demosthenes when *choregus*.

<sup>f</sup> See the Hymn, in *Apoll.* 147 sqq. respecting the choruses at the Ionian festivals at Delos.

islands, carry us back to the earlier times of Greece. The drama was the result of those choruses; but from its nature it could only be a later product of the poetical spirit of the Greeks.

We have here only to consider the drama as influencing the government and public opinion. An inquiry, however, of great extent; for which we will examine what the state did for the drama, and in return, what effect the drama had on public affairs.

Dramatic poetry, the object of which is to give a distinct and lively representation of an action, always requires decorations, whether they be splendid or paltry; and an assembly, before which the representation may be made. Dramatic poetry, therefore, is essentially of a more public character than any other description of poetical composition. Of all kinds of verse it concerns the state the most nearly. Among the Greeks we may add, that it was an affair of religion, and therefore an essential part of the festivals. But these festivals were entirely an affair of the state, and were considered, as has been observed above, as necessities and not luxuries. Here then we find a reason why the state should not only have so much encouraged dramatic exhibitions, but have even considered them no less essential than the popular assemblies and popular tribunals. A Grecian state could not exist without festivals, nor festivals without choruses and plays.

In what manner the state encouraged the drama we know only with respect to Athens. But that the other Grecian cities both in the mother country and the colonies, had their theatres as well as Athens, is apparent from the remains of them, which are almost always to be found wherever there are traces of a Grecian city. The theatres were built and decorated at the public expense; we find in Grecian cities no instance, as far as I am aware, of their having been erected by private persons, as was usual at Rome. Their struc-

ture was always the same, such as may still be seen in Herculaneum; and we must therefore conclude, that all the external means of representation were the same, although the wealth and taste of individual cities introduced higher degrees of splendour, which in our time we may observe in our larger cities, compared with the smaller or provincial towns. But from the remains of the Grecian theatres, the size and extent of these buildings are apparent, and their great dissimilarity in this respect to modern playhouses. If they had not been regarded as a real want, and if the emulation of the cities had not also exerted its influence, we might doubt whether sufficient means could have been found for erecting them.

The representation of plays was one of the civil burthens (*λειτουργία*) which the opulent were obliged to bear in rotation, or which they voluntarily undertook. We can hardly doubt that the regulations in other cities resembled those in Athens, though on this subject we have no distinct testimony. But although the state threw these expenses in part upon private persons, they were not the less a public concern, as they were considered as a contribution due to the state. Another regulation may astonish us still more than this; viz. that by which money was granted from the public treasury to the poorer citizens, that they might be able to visit the theatres. This was the case in Athens, though not till the time when the state began to sink under the moral corruption of its citizens. The love of pleasure may in such periods degenerate into a sort of frenzy; and the preservation of tranquillity may demand sacrifices which are reluctantly made even by those who consent.

Though the earliest dramatic essays among the Greeks may have belonged to a more remote period, there is no doubt that Eschylus was the father, not only of the finished drama, but also of the Grecian stage; and as he himself fought in the battle of Salamis,

it was not until after the victories over the Persians that a theatre of stone was erected at Athens<sup>g</sup>; and all that concerns the drama began to be developed in that city. The contests of the poets, which were introduced there at the festivals of Bacchus, and which, though they cost the state only a crown, rewarded the poet more than gold could have done, contributed much to excite emulation. It was about this time that Athens began to be the seat of literature, and in the scale of political importance, the first state in Greece. Hence we can explain the remarkable fact, that the dramatic art appeared to be, as it were, at home in that city. Athens directed the taste of the other cities; and without being the capital, in the same degree as Paris and London, her great superiority in intellectual culture secured to her that supremacy, which was the more glorious as it rested not on violence, but on the voluntary acknowledgment of her preeminence.

In what manner, after the erection of a stage at Athens, theatrical amusements were extended throughout the other Grecian cities, has not, as far as I know, been the subject of investigation. The ruins which remain leave it still uncertain when they were built; and where can we find dates to settle this point? But these remains are so numerous as to make it highly probable, that the drama was introduced into the other cities before the Macedonian age. Neither tragic nor comic poets were confined to Athens exclusively; they started up in the most various regions of Greece<sup>h</sup>. Athenian poets were invited to the courts of foreign princes<sup>i</sup>. A king of Syracuse was himself a tragic poet<sup>k</sup>. In the same city Athenian captives regained

<sup>g</sup> The occasion is related by SUIDAS in *Hephaistos*. At the representation of a play of AESCHYLUS, the wooden scaffold on which the spectators stood gave way. \*

<sup>h</sup> Abundant proof may be found in FABRICII, *Bibl. Gr.* t. i. in the *Catalogus Tragicorum et Comicorum deperditorum*.

<sup>i</sup> Euripides was invited to the court of Archelaus king of Macedonia.

<sup>k</sup> Dionysius the elder. A fragment of a play by this prince has been preserved in STOB. *Fellog.* I. iv. 19.

their liberty by reciting fragments from the tragedies of Euripides. The inhabitants of Abdera, when their fellow-citizen Archelaus played the part of Andromeda, were seized with a passion for the theatre bordering on madness<sup>1</sup>. Other proofs, if necessary, might be found. It may seem doubtful, whether the same may be said of the comic drama; which in Athens was of so local a character, that it could hardly have been understood in the other cities, or at least much of its wit would have been lost. But is it safe, from the few remaining plays of a single comic poet, to judge of the hundreds produced by a multitude of others, and no longer extant?

To answer the other question, in what relation the theatre among the Greeks from its very nature stood to the state, we must distinguish its two chief divisions. Before the Macedonian age, while comedy was still permitted to preserve its republican character<sup>m</sup>, tragedy and comedy, as there were no intermediate kinds<sup>n</sup>, remained as different from each other as seriousness and mirth. They had nothing in common.

Tragedy, introducing upon the stage the heroes of Greece, was the representation of great events of former times, according to the ideal conceptions of the Greeks<sup>o</sup>; comedy, on the contrary, was the parody of the present, as we shall hereafter illustrate more fully.

<sup>1</sup> LUCIAN, *de Conscrib. Histor.* vol. iv. p. 159, Bip.

<sup>m</sup> The old comedy, as it was called.

<sup>n</sup> The satyric drama, as it was called, was not an intermediate class, but a variety of tragedy.

<sup>o</sup> Two plays, the Persians of Eschylus, and the Destruction of Miletus of Phryniichus, formed exceptions. But they had no imitators; and the last-mentioned poet was even punished for it by the Athenians. HEROD. vi. 21. Here too we observe the correct judgment of the Greeks, which desired in the tragic drama an excitement of the passions; but purely of the passions, without any personal allusions. This was possible only in subjects taken from early times. But still a certain regard for historical truth, as contained in the traditions, was required by the Grecian taste. Subjects altogether fictitious were unknown. The consequences of this deserve to be illustrated at large. If the tragic drama was thus limited to the traditions respecting the heroes, it at the same time obtained a certain solemn support which gave it dignity.

In these definitions the whole difference of the two has been expressed.

Tragedy was in certain respects a result of epic poetry. For this had always preserved the recollection of the heroic age; without which the tragic poets would have had to contend with difficulties not less than those of the moderns, when they have borrowed subjects from the fables of the north. It was only necessary to mention the name of the chief person, and the whole story of his adventures was recalled to every mind. Hence the artificial weaving of a plot was only so far a duty of the poet as the nature of the drama requires; grandeur and liveliness of manner were, on the contrary, far more in the spirit of the heroic world. Not the event, but the character of the action, was important. Whether the issue was fortunate or unfortunate was a matter of indifference: but it was necessary that the action should be in itself sublime; should be the result of the impulse of the passions; and should never depart from the gravity, which is, as it were, the colouring of the heroic character. In this consists the tragic part of the drama. But though the final event was in itself indifferent, it was natural for the poets to prefer subjects in which the chief personages were unfortunate. In such the tragic interest was the greatest; the catastrophe the most tremendous; the effect least uncertain. A tragical issue suited best the whole character of the kind of poetry.

The tragic drama had but few points of relation with the state. The political condition there exhibited was entirely different from the actual state of the times; the forms of monarchy alone being introduced on the stage. The same remark, therefore, which has been made respecting the epic<sup>p</sup>, is true also of the tragic poetry of the Greeks. The violent commotions in the ancient royal families, and their extinction, were not

<sup>p</sup> See above, p. 105.

represented to make them objects of contempt or hatred, and to quicken the spirit of republicanism, but solely because no other actions equally possessed the sublimity of the tragic character. But the moral effects which were produced by these representations may have been politically important. Whilst the Greeks continued to live in the heroic world, that elevation of mind was more easily preserved which is so frequently seen in their actions. If Homer and the epic poets first raised its spirit to the sublimity belonging to it, the tragic poets did much to preserve that elevated tone. And if this elevated spirit formed the strength of the state, they have as strong a claim to immortality as the military commanders and the leaders of the people.

Comedy was more closely allied to the state; as we may infer from the circumstance, that it had relation to the present and not to the past. We have explained it above to be the parody of the present<sup>4</sup>; that is, of the actual state of public affairs, in the sense in which the Greeks understood this expression. Private life, as such, was never the subject of comedy, except so far as it was connected with the public. But they were in so many and such various ways so closely connected, that the comic poet could not but frequently present views of private life. Comedy was therefore altogether of a political tendency, so far as we comprehend everything public under this word. But the scenes which were exhibited were not represented with fidelity, but caricatured. This seems to have been agreed upon by a tacit understanding; and therefore

<sup>4</sup> A. W. SCHLEGEL, in his work on Dramatic Literature, vol. i. p. 271, considers the characteristic of comedy to have been, that it was a parody of tragedy. It certainly was so very frequently, and thus far his remark is correct. Tragedy was a part of the public life; the parody of tragedy was therefore a fit subject for the comic stage; and the relation between the tragic and comic poets was such, that the latter were naturally fond of ridiculing the former. The readers of Aristophanes know this. Yet we must be very careful how we confine the range of comedy to this.

such representations did not injure those against whom they were directed more than the caricatures of modern times. We would not be understood wholly to justify the incredible shamelessness of the Grecian comic poets, in whose eyes neither men, nor morals, nor the gods, were sacred. But a public tribunal of character is an actual necessity where a popular government exists; and in those times what other tribunal could have existed than the theatre? Whatever excited public attention, whether in persons or in things, would probably be brought upon the stage. The most powerful demagogue, in the height of his power, did not escape this fate; nay, the people of Athens had the satisfaction of seeing itself personified and brought upon the stage, where it could laugh at itself till it was satisfied with mirth<sup>r</sup>; and the poet was crowned for having done so. What is our freedom of the press, our licentiousness of the press, compared with this freedom and licentiousness of the drama?

But though the ridicule of the comic poets did not much injure the individual against whom it chanced to be directed, we have still to inquire what effect the comic drama had upon public institutions and on morals, which with the Greeks were inseparably connected. Those judgments passed on public characters perhaps had some influence, but not a great deal; unless perhaps to make men more cautious; and this was no small consideration. When we see that Pericles, notwithstanding all the attacks of the comic poets<sup>s</sup>, could not be deposed: and that even Cleon, when he had been made a public jest in the Knights of Aristophanes, lost nothing of his influence, we cannot make a very high estimate of that advantage. So far as morals are concerned, it is true that the ideas of propriety are conventional; and that it would be

<sup>r</sup> In the *Knights* of ARISTOPHANES,

<sup>s</sup> Specimens of them may be seen in PLUTARCH, vol. i. p. 620.

wrong to infer from a violation of them in language, a corresponding violation in action. The inhabitant of the north, who has not been accustomed to the much greater license given to the tongue by the southern nations, may here easily be mistaken. The jokes of Harlequin, especially in his extemporaneous performances, are often hardly less indecent than those of Aristophanes; but the southern countries are not on that account *on the whole* more corrupt than the northern, although some offences are more common in them. But the incredible levity with which the rules of modesty were transgressed, could not and did not remain without consequences. Another important point is the influence of comedy on the religion of the people. The comic poets were careful never to appear as atheists; that would have led to exile; they rather defended the popular religion. But the manner in which this was done, was often worse than a direct attack. Who could appear with reverent devotion at the altar of Jove, after laughing at him in the Clouds, or after having seen him pay court to earthly beauties. Even on the minds of the most frivolous nation that ever existed, these things must have made indelible impressions.

The ancient comedy has commonly been called a political farce; and the expression is just, if we interpret the word *political* in the wide sense in which we have explained it. It is sufficiently known that, after the downfall of the democracy, there was no longer any field for this ancient comedy, that it lost its sting in the middle comedy, as it is termed, and that the new was of an entirely different character<sup>t</sup>. As this new kind lost its local character with the personal allusions, the old obstacles to its diffusion throughout Greece no longer existed. And though we may doubt whether the plays of Cratinus and Aristophanes were ever acted

<sup>t</sup> The difference of these kinds is best explained in the excellent work of SCHLEGEL, vol. i. p. 226.

out of Athens, no question can certainly be raised as to those of Menander and Diphilus. But this new species of theatrical composition not having been introduced and perfected till the Macedonian age, the subject does not fall within the subject of the present work.

To us it would seem that the connection of the arts with politics is much less than that of the theatre ; and yet it was among the Greeks even closer and more various. The encouragement of the arts is in our times left chiefly to private taste ; and is greater or less according to the number of amateurs. The state takes an interest in them only to prevent their total decay, or for the sake of some particular design.

The case was entirely different in the period when they flourished among the Greeks. The arts with them were exclusively public, and not in any degree the concern of individuals. They afterwards became so to a certain extent ; but yet never so much as with us ; nor even as with the Romans. These positions require to be farther developed and accurately proved.

By the arts we mean the three great branches of them, architecture, sculpture, and painting. On each of these we have some remarks to offer.

Architecture is distinguished from the two others by its object being use no less than beauty. Not only the moderns, but the Romans of the later ages, endeavoured to unite them both ; and in this manner private buildings became objects of this art. Among the Greeks, a tendency to this seems to have existed in the heroic age. In a former chapter we remarked, that in the dwellings and halls of the kings there prevailed a certain grandeur and splendour, which, however, we can hardly designate by the name of scientific architecture. When the monarchical forms disappeared, and the habit of living in cities began to prevail, and republican equality at the same time gained

ground, those differences in the dwellings disappeared of themselves; and all that we read respecting private houses in every subsequent age, confirms us in the idea that they had no pretensions to elegance of construction<sup>u</sup>. It would be difficult to produce a single example of such a building. Indeed, we find express evidence to the contrary. Athens was by no means a fine city like some of our modern ones, in which there are whole streets of palaces occupied as the dwellings of private persons. A stranger could have been at Athens without imagining himself to be in the city which contained the greatest masterpieces of architecture. The splendour of the city was not perceived till the public squares and the Aeropoli were approached<sup>x</sup>. The small dwellings of Themistocles and Aristides were long pointed out; and the building of large houses was regarded as a proof of pride<sup>y</sup>. But when luxury increased, houses were built on a larger scale; several chambers for the accommodation of strangers and for other purposes were built round the court, which commonly formed the centre; but all this might take place and yet the building could lay no claims to beauty. If a town, which was, it is true, but a provincial town, may be cited to corroborate this, we have one still before our eyes. A walk through the excavated streets of Pompeii, will be sufficient to establish our remark. Where the pomp and splendour of the public edifices were so great as among the Greeks, it was not possible for private buildings to rival them.

Architecture, as applied to public purposes, began with the construction of temples; and till the time of the Persian war, or that which immediately preceded it, we hear of no other considerable public edifices.

<sup>u</sup> The statements of writers of the Macedonian or the Roman age, are not here taken into consideration, since we are not treating of those times.

<sup>x</sup> DICEARCHUS *de Statu Gracia*, cap. 8. Huds.

<sup>y</sup> DEMOSTHENES reproaches the wealthy Midias with his large house at Eleusis, which intercepted the light of others, p. 565.

The number of temples remarkable for their architecture, was until that time limited ; although in the age just preceding the war with Persia, this art had already produced some of its first works among the Greeks. In Greece itself the temple of Delphi was the most celebrated, after it had been rebuilt by the Alcmaeonidæ<sup>a</sup>. There was also the temple of Apollo in Delos. But it was about this time, that the invention of the Ionic order by the Asiatic Greeks in addition to the Doric, which had been used till then, constituted a new epoch in the history of architecture. The splendid temple of Diana at Ephesus, erected by the joint exertions of the cities and princes of Grecian Asia, was the first building in this new style<sup>a</sup>. About the same time, Polycrates built the temple of Juno in Samos. The temples which afterwards formed the glory of Greece, those of Athens on the Acropolis and elsewhere, were all erected after the Persian war. So too was the temple of Jupiter at Olympia. As to the temples in Lower Italy and Sicily, we can fix the epoch in which (if not all, yet the largest and most splendid of them) the chief temples of Agrigentum were erected; and that epoch is also subsequent to the Persian war<sup>b</sup>. And if those of the ancient Doric order, at Paestum and Segestus, belong to an earlier period, it cannot be to one much more early ; as these cities themselves were founded long after those in Asia Minor. Just before and after the Persian war, arose that prodigious emulation of the cities, to make themselves famous for their temples ; and this produced those masterpieces of architecture.

The other principal kinds of public buildings which were conspicuous for their splendour, were the theatres,

HEROD. v. 62.

See the work of HIRT, *der Tempel der Diana zu Ephesus*, Berlin, 1809.

An accurate enumeration of the chief temples of the Greeks, and the periods in which they were built, is to be found in STIEGLITZ, *Geschichte Baukunst der Alten*, Leipzig, 1792.

the places for musical exhibitions, the porticoes, and the gymnasia. Of the theatres it has already been observed that they were erected subsequently to the Persian war. The same is true of the halls for music. The porticoes, those favourite places of resort to a people who lived so much in public, belonged in part to the temples<sup>c</sup>, and in part surrounded the public squares. Of those in Athens, which by their works of art eventually eclipsed the rest, we know that they were not built till after the victory over the barbarians. Of all the public edifices the gymnasia are those respecting which we have the fewest accounts<sup>d</sup>. They were probably erected at a distance behind the temples; though many of them were distinguished by splendid works of art.

This line of division, carefully drawn between domestic and public architecture by the Greeks, who regarded only the latter as belonging to the fine arts, gives a new proof of their correct taste. In buildings destined for dwellings, convenience and architecture are in constant opposition. The latter desires in its works to execute some grand idea independent of the common wants of life; but a dwelling is intended to meet those very wants, and is in no respect founded on ideas connected with beauty. The temples are dwellings also, but dwellings of the gods; and as they have no wants in their places of abode, art finds here no obstacle to its inventive powers.

The plastic art<sup>e</sup> and painting bore to each other among the Greeks, an opposite relation to that which they have in modern times. The first was the most cultivated; and though the latter attained the rank of

<sup>c</sup> As e. g. the λέσχη at Olympia, respecting which BOETTIGER, in his *Geschichte der Malerey*, vol. i. p. 296, has given us a learned essay, as also in general respecting those places to which the public resorted for conversation.

<sup>d</sup> On those at Athens, consult STIEGLITZ, ib. p. 220.

<sup>e</sup> The phrase *plastic art* is used, because there is no other which embraces at once works of art formed of stone and of bronze.

an independent art, it never was able to gain the superiority. It is not for us here to explain the causes of this difference; we need only mention one, which to us is the most interesting. The more public the arts are among any people, the more naturally will the plastic art surpass that of painting. The works of both may be public, and were so among the Greeks, but those of the former are far better suited for public monuments than those of the latter. The works of painting find their place only on walls; those of the plastic art, as having an independent character, wherever there is room for them.

The works of the plastic art, statues and busts, were, in the times of which we speak, (and among the Greeks, with a few exceptions, even in subsequent times,) only public works, that is, designed to be set up, not in private dwellings but in public places, such as temples, porches, market-places, gymnasia, and theatres. I know of no instance of a statue that belonged to a private man; and if there exists any example, it is an exception which confirms the general rule<sup>f</sup>. It may be objected, that it is only accidental that we know of no such instances. But if any taste of that kind had prevailed at Athens, we should find traces of it in the comedians and orators; and as in them no such indication occurs, we may, without hesitation, abide by the above statement.

Phidias and his successors, until the Macedonian age, did not therefore labour for the houses and collections of individuals. But though they did not work for private collections, they worked for private persons. For, had not this been the case, the incredible multitude of statues which we have already mentioned, could

<sup>f</sup> Or can the anecdote be cited, which Pausanias relates, i. p. 46, of the cunning of Phryne to gain possession of the god of love, made by her lover Praxiteles? Even if it be true, the fact is in our favour; for she consecrated it immediately as a public work of art in Thespiae, ATHEN. p. 591; in which city it was from that time to be seen, Cic. in Ver. ii. 4. 2.

never have been made<sup>g</sup>. This subject is so important that we must treat of it more at large.

The great masters were chiefly in the employ of the public. The community, either directly or through its leaders, as we learn from the instance of Pericles, either ordered works of art, or bought them ready made, to ornament the city and the public buildings. We have distinct evidence that the great masterpieces of Phidias, Praxiteles, and Lysippus, had this origin. Thus were produced the Jupiter at Olympia, the Minerva Polias at Athens, by Phidias; the Venus at Cnidus and at Cos, by Praxiteles; the Colossus of Rhodes, by Lysippus. Yet numerous as were the applications of cities, the immense multitude of statues could not be accounted for, unless the piety and the vanity of individuals had come to their assistance.

Piety produced the votive offerings; of which all the celebrated temples were full. These were not always works of art, being as often mere costly presents. Yet the collections of statues and pictures which belonged to those temples, consisted, for the most part, of votive offerings<sup>h</sup>. But these were as often the tribute of gratitude from whole cities, as from individuals<sup>i</sup>.

The vanity of individuals contributed to the same end, by the custom of erecting statues, commonly of bronze, to the victors in the games<sup>k</sup>. When we re-

<sup>g</sup> The infinite wealth of Greece in treasures of this kind, has been clearly exhibited in JACOBS, *Über den Reichthum Griechenlands an plastischen Kunstwerken und die Ursachen desselben*.

<sup>h</sup> Not to mention Olympia and Delphi again, we refer to the temple of Juno in Samos, STRAB. xiv. p. 438, of Bacchus at Athens, PAUS. i. 20. The temple of Diana at Ephesus was so rich in works of art, that, according to PLIN. H. N. xxxvi. 14, a description of them would have filled several volumes.

<sup>i</sup> The temples received such presents not only during the lifetime of the donors, but as legacies. A remarkable instance of this is found in the will of Conon, who left 5000 pieces of gold (*στατῆρες*) for that purpose, LYS. p. 639. REISK.

<sup>k</sup> See the passage in PLINY. H. N. xxxiv. 9. His remark, that a statue was erected in honour of every victor at Olympia, seems hardly credible. COMP. PAUS. vi. p. 452.

member the multitude of these games in Greece, the number of statues will become intelligible ; especially of those of bronze, of which in many instances more than one cast was made ; as the native cities of the victors would hardly fail in this manner to appropriate to themselves the fame of their citizens, which formed so much a subject of pride.

Painting, from its very nature, seems to have been more designed for private use. Yet in the age of Pericles, when the great masters in this art appeared in Athens, it was hardly less publicly applied than the art of sculpture. It was in the public porticoes and temples that Polygnotus, Micon, and others, exhibited the productions of their genius<sup>1</sup>. No trace is to be found of celebrated private pictures in those times<sup>m</sup>.

Yet portrait-painting seems peculiarly to belong to private life. This branch of the art was certainly cultivated among the Greeks ; but not till the Macedonian age. The likenesses of celebrated men were placed in the pictures which commemorated their actions ; as that of Miltiades in the painting of the battle in the Poccile, or pictured portico at Athens ; or the artists found a place for themselves or their mistresses in such public works<sup>n</sup>. But portrait-painting, as such, did not, in fact, flourish till the times of Philip and Alexander ; and was first practised in the school of Apelles<sup>o</sup>. When powerful princes arose,

<sup>1</sup> See BOETTIGER's *Ideen zur Archäologie der Malerey*, vol. i. p. 274 sqq.

<sup>m</sup> It is true, Andocides reproached Alcibiades, in his oration against him, with having shut up a painter, who was painting his house ; vol. iv. p. 119. Reisk. But this was not the way to obtain a fine specimen of the art. Allusion is there made to the painting of the whole house, not of an isolated work of art ; and we are not disposed to deny, that, in the times of Alcibiades, it was usual to decorate the walls with paintings. On the contrary, this was then very common ; for the very painter Archagathus gives, as his excuse, that he had already contracted to work for several others. But these common paintings are not to be compared with those in the temples and porticoes ; which, as Boettiger has proved, *Idem*, p. 282, were painted, not on the walls, but on wood.

<sup>n</sup> Polygnotus, e. g. introduced the beautiful Elpinice, the daughter of Miltiades, as Laodice, PLUT. vol. iii. p. 178.

<sup>o</sup> This appears from the accounts in PLIN. II. N. xxxv. xxxvi. 12 sqq.

curiosity or flattery desired to possess their likeness ; the artists were most sure of receiving compensation for such labours ; and private statues as well as pictures began to grow common ; although in most cases something of ideal beauty was added to the resemblance <sup>v</sup>.

We have ventured directly to assert, that the arts in their flourishing period belonged exclusively to the public ; and were not, as is commonly stated or implied, divided between them and private life. Be it remembered, this is to be understood only of works of art, in the proper sense of the expression ; that is, of those which had no other object than to be works of art ; of statues, therefore, and pictures ; not of all kinds of sculpture and painting. That the arts connected with private wants were applied to objects of domestic life, to articles of household furniture, to candelabra, vases, tapestry, and garments, will be denied by no one who is acquainted with antiquity.

It was not till Lucullus, Verres, and others among the Romans, had gratified their taste as amateurs, that the arts were introduced into private life ; and yet even in Rome Agrippa could propose to restore to the public all the treasures of the arts which lay buried in the villas. It might therefore be naturally expected, that under such circumstances the ancient destination of arts among the Greeks should have been changed, and they should have so far degenerated as to become the means of gratifying the luxury of individuals. And yet this never took place. This can be proved as well of the mother country, as of the richest of the colonies.

Pausanias, in the second century after the Christian era, travelled through all Greece, and saw and described all the works of art which existed there. Nevertheless, I know of no one instance in all Pausanias of

<sup>v</sup> BOERTIGER's *Andeutungen*, p. 183 sqq.

a work of art belonging to a private man; much less of whole collections. Everything was in his day, as before, in the temples, porticoes, and squares. If private persons had possessed works of art, who would have prevented his describing them?

Verres plundered Sicily of its works of art wherever he could find them; and his accuser will hardly be suspected of having concealed anything. But in this accusation, with one single exception<sup>q</sup>, only public works of art are mentioned. May we not infer from this, that no considerable productions of the fine arts were possessed by private persons in Sicily?

So deeply, therefore, was the idea rooted among the Greeks that the works of artists were public, that it could not be eradicated even by the profanations of the Romans. It was thus that by attaining their proper end they flourished so greatly in Greece. The works of art were considered as belonging not to individuals, but to the cultivated part of mankind. They should be a common property. Even in our times, when individuals are permitted to possess them, censure is incurred if others also are not allowed to enjoy them. But even where this privilege is conceded, it is not a matter of indifference whether an individual or the nation is the possessor. The respect shown by the state to the arts in the possession of their productions, confers a higher value on their labours. How much more honoured does the artist feel, how much more freely does he breathe, when he knows that he is exerting himself for a nation which will esteem its glory increased by his works, instead of toiling for the money and the caprices of individuals?

Such was the condition of the arts in Greece. When

<sup>q</sup> Viz. the four statues which he took from Heius, Cic. in *Terrem*, ii. 4. 2. Even these however stood in a chapel (*sacrarium*), and were therefore in a certain measure public. The name of Heius seems, moreover, to betray that the family was not of Grecian origin. But what does one such exception, and in such an age, prove respecting an earlier period?

emulation arose among the cities to be distinguished by possessing works of art, a field was opened for Phidias and Polygnotus, for Praxiteles and Parrhasius. They were better rewarded by glory than by money; some of them never worked for pay<sup>r</sup>. Need we then add any farther remarks to explain why the vigour of the fine arts expired with liberty? Philip and Alexander still saw a Lysippus and an Apelles; but with them ends a series of creative minds, such as no other nation has ever produced.

But the taste of the nation for the productions of art did not end with those artists. They had taken too good care to perpetuate that fondness. When the Grecians had lost almost everything else, they were still proud of their works of art. This excited even the respect and admiration of the Romans. "These works of art, these statues, these pictures," says Cicero<sup>s</sup>, "delight the Greeks beyond everything. From their complaints you may learn<sup>t</sup>, that that is most bitter to them which to us appears perhaps trivial and easy to be borne. Of all acts of oppression and injustice which foreigners and allies in these times have been obliged to endure, nothing has been more hard for the Grecians to bear, than this plundering of their temples and cities."

Hitherto we have endeavoured to consider Greece in all those relations in which she became glorious as a

<sup>r</sup> Polygnotus painted the variegated portico (*στοά ποικίλη*) for nothing; Zeuxis, in the last part of his life, would receive no pay for his pictures, but gave them away, *Plin. H. N.* xxxv. 36. This enables us partly to explain how the cities could support the great expense for works of art. Besides, in Greece, as in Italy, the works of the great masters did not become dear till after their death. The little that we know of their personal condition and circumstances, represents them for the most part as men of fine feelings and good fellowship, who, like the divine Raphael and Corregio in the moments sacred to mental exertion, raised themselves above human nature, but otherwise enjoyed life without troubling themselves much about money. Phidias, with all his masterpieces, did not gain half as much as Gorgia with his declamations.

<sup>s</sup> CICERO, in *Terrem*, ii. 4 59.

<sup>t</sup> Of the robberies of Verres.

nation. Who is it, we may finally ask, that ensured her immortality? Was it her generals and rulers alone; or was it equally her sages, her poets, and her artists? The voice of ages has decided, and posterity justly places the images of these heroes of peace by the side of those of the warriors and kings<sup>u</sup>.

<sup>u</sup> See VISCONTI, *Iconographie Ancienne*, Paris, 1811.

## CHAPTER XVI.

### CAUSES OF THE FALL OF GREECE.

THE melancholy task of explaining the causes which led to the fall of Greece, has already been much facilitated by the preceding investigations. Most of them will naturally suggest themselves to the reader; we have only to illustrate them somewhat more at large, and arrange them in a manner to admit of being distinctly comprehended in a single view<sup>a</sup>.

If the constitutions of the individual Grecian states were defective, the constitution of the whole Grecian system was still more so. Though geographically united, they cannot be said to have formed one political whole. A lasting union was never established between the Grecian states; and a transitory and very imperfect alliance was effected only in times of danger, as in the Persian wars.

But even this imperfect union was productive of important results. The league then established suggested the idea of the supremacy of a single state. It has already been shown in what manner Athens managed to acquire this rank, and in what manner that city turned it to her advantage; but we have also shown that a partial supremacy alone existed, embracing only the maritime towns and islands, and therefore necessarily resting for its support on the dominion of the seas on each side of Greece, and consequently on a navy.

This was a result of the political relations of Greece, and the nature of the league. But the consciousness of superiority excited those who were possessed of it to

<sup>a</sup> See DRUMANN, *Geschichte des Verfalls der Griechischen Staaten*, Berlin, 1815.

abuse it; and the allies began to be oppressed. Athens, having once established her greatness on this supremacy, would not renounce it when the ancient motives had ceased to operate after the peace with Persia. Individual states attempted to reclaim by force the independence which was not voluntarily conceded to them. This led to wars with them; and hence the dominion of the sea was followed by all the other evils of which Isocrates complains<sup>b</sup>.

The chief reason of this internal division was not so much the difference of government as of character and disposition. There was a gulf of separation between the Doric and Ionic races which never could be filled up; a voluntary union of the two for any length of time was impossible. Several causes may be mentioned as having contributed to render this division incurable. First, these two tribes were divided geographically. In the mother country, the Dorians had the ascendancy in the Peloponnesus, the Ionians in Attica, Eubœa, and many of the islands. Again, their dialects were different; a few words were sufficient to show to which race a man belonged. Nor was the difference in manners less considerable, especially with regard to women, who among the Dorians were admitted to public society, while those of the Ionians passed their lives shut up in their own chambers. And the common people were much influenced by the circumstance, that the festivals celebrated by the two races were not the same.

But that which rendered the division incurable was, that Sparta was, or at least desired to be, considered the head of the whole Doric race. This state, both in its public and private constitution, was in almost every respect the opposite of Athens. As it was governed by the laws of Lycurgus alone, the other Doric states did not at all resemble it; but as it was ambitious of

<sup>b</sup> ISOCRAT. *de Pace*, p. 476. ed. Steph.

being their head, its influence decided, at least in the mother country. But that influence was often extended to the colonies; and though the Persian authority may have repressed the hatred of the tribes in Asia Minor, it continued with the greatest acrimony in Sicily. In the war of the Syracusans against the Leonines, the Dorian cities were on the side of the former, the Ionian on that of the latter; and the cities of Lower Italy, in their choice of sides, were influenced by the same consideration<sup>c</sup>.

This hatred, preserved and inflamed by the ambition common to both, of obtaining the supremacy over Greece, was finally followed by that great civil contest which is called the Peloponnesian war. Of nearly equal duration, it was to Greece what the thirty years' war was to Germany<sup>d</sup>, without having been terminated by a similar peace. Being a revolutionary war, in the true sense of the word, it had all the consequences attendant on such a struggle. The spirit of faction was enabled to strike such deep root, that it never more could be eradicated; and the abuse which Sparta made of her forced supremacy, was fitted to supply it with continual nourishment. Who has described this with more truth or accuracy than Thucydides? "By this war," says he<sup>e</sup>, "all Greece was set in motion; for on all sides dissensions prevailed between the popular party and the higher order. The former desired to call in the Athenians; the latter the Lacedæmonians. The cities were shaken by sedition; and where this broke out at a less early period, the attempt was made to commit greater excesses than any which had elsewhere taken place. Even the significations of words were changed. Mad rashness was called disinterested courage; prudent delay was styled timidity. Whoever

<sup>c</sup> THUCYD. iii. 86.

<sup>d</sup> It lasted from 431 to 404 B.C. when it was terminated by the capture of Athens.

<sup>e</sup> THUCYD. iii. 82. We have selected only a few remarks from a passage written for all succeeding ages.

was violent was held worthy of confidence; whoever opposed him was suspected. The crafty was called intelligent; the more crafty, still more intelligent. In short, praise was given to him who anticipated another in injustice; and to him who encouraged to crime one who had never thought of it."

From the words of the historian, the effect of these revolutions on morals is apparent; and yet no states rested so much on morals as the Grecian. For were they not communities which governed themselves? Did not the laws enter most deeply into private life? and was not anarchy a necessary consequence of moral corruption? This was soon felt in Athens. Throughout the whole of Aristophanes we see the contrast between the better times that were gone by, and the bad which had arrived in every part of public and domestic life; in poetry, in eloquence, in education, in the courts of justice, etc.; and finally, in a celebrated dialogue, the ancient and the modern customs are introduced disputing upon the stage<sup>e</sup>. And who can read the orators without being astonished at the incredible corruption of manners?

This leads us to a kindred topic, the profanation of the popular religion. The careful student of the history of Greece will observe this profanation increase as he approaches the age of Philip; and though other causes, perhaps, had some influence, we can only on this principle explain the origin of a religious war like the Phocian. The causes which produced the decay of the popular religion may for the most part be found in a former chapter. It would be useless to attempt to deny, that the speculations of the philosophers had a great share in it; although the better part of them were strenuous in their efforts to avert such a result. Aristophanes was certainly unjust in attributing such designs to Socrates, but he was right in attributing it

<sup>e</sup> The Λόγος ἴκτιος and ἀῖκτος in the Clouds.

to philosophy in general. Now whether the blame lies on the side of philosophy, or of the popular religion, is a question which naturally occurs, and may be easily answered from what has been above remarked<sup>f</sup>. A nation with a religion like that of the Greeks, must either refrain from philosophical inquiries, or learn from philosophy that its religion is unfounded. This result cannot be urged against the philosophers as a crime, but they are only chargeable with a want of prudence in promulgating their positions. The care taken by the best of them in this respect has already been mentioned; and that the state was not indifferent to the practice of the rest, is proved by the punishments which were inflicted on many of them. But though the systems of the philosophers were restricted to the schools, many philosophical opinions were extended wider, and to a certain degree adopted by the common people. In Athens the comic poets assisted in producing this effect; for, whether with or without design, they disseminated the doctrines which they ridiculed.

The most melancholy proof of the decay of religious feeling is found in the Phocian war, and the manner in which that war was conducted. In the time of Thucydides, Delphi and its oracle were still revered<sup>g</sup>; although the Spartans began even then to doubt its claims to confidence<sup>h</sup>. When the foreign relations of the different states were changed by the Peloponnesian war and its consequences, those towards the gods were also destroyed; and the crimes committed against them brought on their own punishment in a new civil war and the downfall of liberty. The treasures stolen from Delphi, with which the war was carried on, suddenly increased the mass of coined money current in Greece to an unheard-of degree; while they increased, in an

<sup>f</sup> See the third chapter.

<sup>g</sup> THUCYD. v. 32.

<sup>h</sup> THUCYD. v. 16.

equal degree, luxury and the wants of life<sup>i</sup>. And if any portion of the ancient spirit remained, it was destroyed by the custom of employing mercenary soldiers, a custom which became every day more common, and gave a death-blow to valour and patriotism.

Thus the evils of which the superior policy of a neighbouring state knew how to take advantage, were the result of defects in the political constitution; in that very constitution, without which those glorious fruits which were borne by the tree of Grecian liberty, never could have come to maturity. But amidst all the disorder and all the losses, everything did not perish. The national spirit, though its existence was often threatened, still remained alive, and with it the hope of better times. Amidst all their wars with one another, the Greeks never ceased to consider themselves as one nation. The idea of one day assuming that character animated the best of them. It is an idea which is expressed in almost every one of the writings of the pure Isocrates<sup>k</sup>; and which he could not survive, when, after the battle of Chæronea, the spirit of the “old man eloquent” voluntarily escaped from its earthly veil, beneath which it had passed a hundred years. Yet the echo of his wishes, his prayers, and his instructions, did not die away. Still the last of the Greeks had not yet appeared; and the times were to come, when, in the Achæan league, the splendid noon of the greatness of Greece was to be followed by a splendid evening. So certain is it, that a nation is never deserted by destiny so long as it does not desert itself.

<sup>i</sup> See on this point ATHEN. iv. p. 231.

<sup>k</sup> See especially PANATHEN. p. 235.

## INDEX.

- A**CARNANIA, 31.  
Achaia, 20. The twelve cities of the Achaean league, 21.  
Achæan race, its settlements, 39.  
Æschylus, the father not only of the finished drama, but also of the Grecian stage, 277.  
Ætolia, 31.  
Agesilaus. Model of a Grecian general, 207.  
——— the first to form a numerous cavalry, ib.  
Agriculture, 79, 163.  
Alcibiades, vanity his leading trait, 231.  
Amphiptyonic assemblies, 116.  
——— council held at Delphi and Thermopyle, 119. Not mentioned by Homer, ib. Oaths taken by the members of, 121.  
Anaxagoras, his connection with Pericles, 245.  
Arcadia, description of, 15.  
Architecture distinguished from sculpture and painting by its object being use as well as beauty, 284.  
——— private houses had no pretensions to elegance of construction, 285.  
——— as applied to public purposes began with the construction of temples, ib.  
——— invention of the Ionic order constituted a new epoch in the history of, 286.  
——— theatres, places for musical exhibitions, porticoes, and gymnasia, 287.  
Archon of Athens, the second, presided over the public ceremonies of religion, 60.  
Areopagus, the most ancient court with which the Greeks were acquainted, 188.  
Areopagus of Athens, 26.  
Archipelago, 34.  
Argolis, description of, 17.  
Aristides, his influence grounded on the conviction of his honesty and disinterestedness, 225.  
Aristocracies and Democracies, difference between, 140.  
Armies. After the establishment of the Republican constitutions, consisted chiefly of citizens, 197. Large ones could be collected only by the union of many states, 198.  
Army. No large Grecian, brought into the field after the battle of Plateæ, 199.  
——— in Athens subordinate to the navy, 200.  
Art, works of. Sicily plundered of by Verres, 292. The Grecians still proud of them when they had lost almost every thing else, 293.  
Artists, some who never worked for pay, ib.  
Arts, the, in their flourishing period belonged exclusively to the public, 291. Not introduced into private life till Lucullus Verres and others among the Romans had gratified their taste as amateurs, ib. Their perfection the standard of national improvement in Greece, 244. Exclusively public, and not in any degree the concern of individuals, 284.  
Assembly, called by the Greeks a senate, 147.  
Athens, description of, 24. Cause of its deep rooted hatred to Sparta, ib. Supremacy of, 129. Connected with her naval superiority, 132. Usurpation of the judiciary power by the Athenians over the allies, 153. Her dominion of the sea con-

- sidered by Isocrates as the source of all the misery of Athens and Greece, 135. Its political preponderance depended on the preservation of its supremacy over Greece, 228.
- Attica, the favourite land of the Gods, description of, 22. Its fine climate, 23.
- B**ARBARIAN, meaning of this word, 108. Origin of the wars between the Greeks and them, 127.
- Bards, a separate class in society, on an equal footing with the heroes, 94. Compared to the improvisatori of Italy, 95. No trace of their having sung the works of others, 95. Changes in the circumstances of the class of, 103.
- Bœotia, description of, 28.
- CADMUS, 66.
- Cavalry, deficiency of, 202.
- Cecrops, 65. His descendants, 67.
- Choruses, their effects, 276.
- Cimon, his policy had but one object, viz. continual war against the Persians, 226.
- Cities, 78. Some in which no general assemblies were held, 147.
- Cities of Magna Graecia governed by the higher classes in the time of Pythagoras, 247.
- Citizen, military service the duty of, 201.
- Citizenship, rights of, 142.
- Civilization of Greece, 42. Great importance of religion in, ib. Colonies from abroad, 64. Their influence upon civilization, 66. Very early in Crete, 69.
- Coined money, statement of the Parian Chronicle respecting, 167. Not known to the Greeks before the foundation of their colonies, ib. When first current in Greece, 166.
- Coining gold the privilege of the state, 168.
- Colonies from abroad, 64. Cecrops from Sais the first, 65. Danaus from Chemmis, ib. Cadmus from Phœnicia, ib. Their influence on civilization, 66.
- Comedy, the parody of the present, 281. Altogether of a political tendency, ib. Its influence on the religion of the people, 283. Ancient has commonly been called a political farce, ib.
- Confederations of cities, 92.
- Constitution, a perfect, attempts to sketch the model of, 259.
- of the Greeks defective, 295. Their value, 157.
- of the Greeks had nothing in common with those of the large empires of modern times, 137. They were all free, 138. Establishment of free, 91. Of the heroic age, 77.
- Corinth, city of, 21.
- Councils, 148.
- Crete, its early civilization, 69.
- D**EITIES, see *Grecian*.
- Delphi, 29. Oracle, by whom founded, 68.
- Demosthenes did not possess the means which Pitt could employ to form a party, 241.
- the most sublime and the purest tragic character with which history is acquainted, 237.
- an accuser in public prosecutions before he ventured to speak on affairs of state, ib.
- various modes by which he protected his country against Macedonian policy, 238.
- joins himself to the ambassadors of the Athenians after the death of Alexander, 239.
- his death, 240.
- Dorians, migration and settlements of, 39. Character of, 40.
- Doric and Ionic races could not be united for any length of time, 296.
- Drama, the, can hardly be discussed separately from lyric poetry, 273.
- the result of the choruses, 276.
- the comic drama in Athens of so local a character that it could hardly be understood in other cities, 279.

- Drama, the tragic, had but few points of relation with the state, 280.
- Duties, custom, 180.
- ELIS, the holy land of Greece, description of, 17. Its three divisions, 18.
- Emigrations, 87.
- Epaminondas, his change in the method of war, 208.
- Epic Poetry, with the Greeks, the source of their national education in poetry and the arts, 93. A fruit of the heroic age, ib.
- emigrated with the colonies to the shores of Asia, 96.
- combination of, and dancing, 96.
- Poets elevate the Gods of Greece, 52. Time needed to mature tradition for the Epic poet, 98.
- Europe, its superiority over other parts of the earth, 1. The causes of this, 3. Its physical features and qualities, 5. Institution of marriage among its inhabitants, 7.
- FAMILIES, internal regulation of, among the Greeks, 81.
- Festivals, a Grecian state could not exist without, 276.
- processions, music, and public shows, an essential part of them, 171.
- mostly religious, 171.
- and games of the Greeks, 112.
- — — — — peculiar to them, 113.
- — — — — their influence on the political affairs of the Grecian states, 114.
- Finance, government of free cities least adapted for the development of an artificial system of, 186.
- Financial system, 169.
- Fleets, cities which built them obliged to seek their timber at a distance, 212.
- difficulty of manning, 212; see *Navy*.
- GEOGRAPHY of Homer, 74.
- Gods, no Grecian city without its, 171.
- Government, hereditary offices in, 151.
- influence of science and literature upon, 244.
- Grecian states, prosperity of, in the age preceding the Persian war, 124. Some grand object of common interest still wanting, ib. The relations of, in the time of Solon had not yet become intricate, 221. A lasting union never established between the, 295.
- lawgivers did not entirely abolish ancient usage, 139.
- deities differed from others, 50. First described by Homer and Hesiod, 51. Influence of their transformation into moral agents on poetry, 54.
- Greece and Italy, natural beauties and productions of, 9.
- GREECE, *geographical view of*, 13—36. highly favoured by nature in regard to situation, 13. Its dimensions, ib. Divisions, 14.
- indebted for its freedom to Athens, 126. To what was her immortality owing, 295. Her constitutions, ib. Corruption of morals in, 298.
- not easy for one district to gain a supremacy over, 35. Its great advantages as an agricultural, pastoral, and commercial country, 35. Early traditions of, 37. Civilization of, 42. Religion of, ib.
- Greeks of Homer, compared with those of later ages, 71.
- fond of works of art, 293.
- had no idea of a commonwealth which did not govern itself; and on this foundation they grounded their systems of legislation, 139.
- nation, earliest state of, 36.
- amidst all their wars with one another never ceased to consider themselves as one nation, 300.
- Gymnasia, no other institutions for the higher branches of instruction before the Macedonian age, 243.

- HELLAS, 22.**
- Hellenic race, predominated in Greece 37, 64. Settlement of its four branches, 39. Mixed with colonies from abroad, 64.
- Herodotus, no writer has received more frequent confirmation by the advances made in the science of geography, 267.**
- Heroic character, differences between the Grecian and Christian, 72.**
- Propensity to extraordinary and bold undertakings common to both, ib.
- Historians, first prose, related in prose what the poets had told in verse, 263.**
- History, all the different kinds of, developed among the Greeks in the period of their freedom, 272.**
- not long confined among the Greeks to that of their own nation, 260.
- of the Greeks emanated from tradition, 261. Continued to be treated in a poetical manner, till near the time of the Persian war, 263. No subject capable of inspiring, before the Persian war, 265.
- Homer, an historical authority, 71.**
- character of the Greek nation formed by, 101.
- and his Works, history of, lost in doubtful obscurity, 97.
- . Difficulty of explaining in modern times how he could have conceived the idea of so extensive a whole as the Iliad and Odyssey, 99. How he could have composed and executed works of such extent, and how those works could have been preserved without the aid of writing, ib.
- life of, ascribed to Herodotus, 104.
- 's poems, Solon's laws respecting, 106.
- first introduced into the Peloponnesus by Lycurgus, 106.
- age of, that in which the Ionic colonies flourished in the vigour of youth, 93.
- Homeric dialect, its influence on Grecian literature, 105.**
- ISLANDS of Greece, 33.**
- Individual welfare connected with the welfare of the state, 160.
- Internal political condition of Greece in the Heroic age, 74.**
- Ionians, 40. Character of, 41.**
- Ionic order, invention of, 287.**
- Isocrates, a teacher of political science, 235.**
- Judicial department, did not form in Greece a separate branch of the government, 187.
- Judicial institutions in modern Europe depended in a great measure on the feudal system, 188.**
- intricacy of, 190.
- the creatures of time and circumstance, 187.
- LACONIA, description of, 15.**
- Law courts, difficulty in fixing the characteristic difference between public and private, 190.
- principles on which Plato made the division, 190.
- Legislation of the Greeks, 139.**
- Locris, description of, 30.**
- MAGISTRATES, 149.**
- no fixed salaries as in modern states, 153.
- bound to acknowledge the obligation of laying their accounts before the people, 183.
- Marathon, victory of, the first splendid military action of the Greeks, 204.**
- Maritime force formed the foundation of the greatness of the first among Grecian cities, 216.**
- Metals, abundance of, 80.**
- Migrations, causes of, 66.**
- Military system in the Heroic age, 83.**
- Militia of a country may, very nearly resemble a standing army, 198.**
- Money, coined, 167.**
- Morals, corruption of in Greece, 298.**
- Museums of Alexandria and Pergamus founded, 243.**
- Mysteries, Religious, of the Greeks, origin of, 56. Degenerated ib. Eleusian, 58.**

- ational spirit and manner of thinking and feeling expressed in the works of the poets, 109.
- Naval engagement, earliest account of, 216.
- between the Persians and Greeks at Artemisium and Salamis, 217.
- between the Ceryaeans and Corinthians at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, 217.
- last two years of the Peloponnesian war remarkable for, 218.
- Naval force, its improvement the cause of pecuniary embarrassment, 175.
- did not exist in Greece till after the invention of the tiriemes, 214.
- Naval science among the Greeks, 212.
- Naval tactics improved in the wars between the Romans and Carthaginians and under the Ptolemies, 219.
- Nominations by election, 151.
- OLIGARCHY**, what the Greeks meant by it, 153.
- Olive trees, very beautiful in Attica, 24.
- Oracle of Dodona, how founded, 68.  
Of Crete and Samothrace, 69.
- Oracles, Foreigners permitted to consult them, 111.
- Oracles, political influence of, 111.
- Orations of Pericles not works of art in the same sense with those of Demosthenes and his contemporaries, 232.
- Oratory, Themistocles and Aristides not skilled in it as an art, 232.
- Ostracism and Petalism, 156.
- Olympia, 18.
- PAINTING**, in the age of Pericles hardly less publicly applied than the art of Sculpture, 290.
- portrait, seems particularly to belong to private life, 290.
- Parnassus, mount, 29.
- Pastoral life among the Greeks, 15.
- Pelops, peninsula of, 14.
- Pelops of Lydia, 66.
- Peloponnesian war, was to Greece what the thirty years' war was to Germany, 297.
- being a revolutionary war, had all the consequences attendant on such a struggle, 297.
- Pericles, desired to be the first man in his own city, and to make his own city the first in Greece, 228.
- Pericles, the model of a statesman, 229.
- Persians, no general union of the Greeks against them, 125.
- Persian war, forms the political character of the Greeks, 125.
- Phidias and his successors, until the Macedonian age, did not labour for the houses and collections of individuals, 288.
- Philosophers, Greek after the time of Pythagoras devoted themselves exclusively to metaphysical speculations, 250.
- Philosophers of the Ionian school, nowhere mentioned that they speculated on polities, 245.
- Philosophy closely united at first with religion 63; separated from, 257.
- Philosophy and religion, collision of, 251.
- Phoenicians, voyages of, 74.
- Piraeus, 27.
- Plato, to comprehend the character of, would require a genius hardly inferior to his own, 258.
- Plays, the representation of, one of the civil burthens, 277.
- Poetical invention, a boundless field opened for, 54.
- Poetry could not be separate from song, in an age when there was as yet no literature, 274.
- Poetry, lyric, intimately connected with the popular religion, 275.
- Poetry, historical, 262.
- Political character of Greece formed by the Persian war, 125.
- Political science among the ancients 159.
- Poll tax, 177.
- Propylea of Athens, 25.

- Protagoras, whether he deserved the name of Atheist, 254.
- Pythagoras, his history involved in the obscurities of tradition and fable, 246.  
— his league, intimately connected with the aristocratical and democratical factions in the Greek states, 246.
- Pythagoras, self-government the object of his moral reform, 247.  
— destruction of his league, by Cylon, 248.  
— not blindly attached to a single form of government, 249.  
His political doctrines, ib.
- Pythagoreans, political doctrines of, 249.  
— did not become extinct though the political agency of the society terminated with its dissolution, 249.
- Public assemblies, organization of, 144.
- RACES, difference of, its great influence, 42.
- Revenue, sources of, 175.  
— Aristotle, his view of the subject, 176.
- Religion in Greece never united to the state as in other countries, 63, 68.
- Religion, the popular causes of its decay, 298.
- Religion, a nation with one like that of the Greeks, must either refrain from philosophical inquiries, or learn from philosophy that its religion is unfounded, 299.
- Religion of the Greeks not contained in any sacred books, ib.  
— — — — — connected with no peculiar doctrines, 110.
- Religious feeling, melancholy proof of the decay in the Phocian war, 299.
- SCIENCES, the government of Greece did little for, 244.  
— — — and literature, their influence upon the government, 244.
- Sculpture, the masterpieces of, furnish the best commentary on the tragedians, 274.
- Sculpture, the more public the arts are among any people, the more naturally will the plastic art surpass that of painting, 288.
- Sculpture and Painting bore to each other among the Greeks, an opposite relation to that which they have in modern times, 287.
- Sicily plundered of her works of art by Verres, 292.
- Sicyon, 21.
- Slavery, prevalence of, 161.  
— light in which the Greek politician considered it, 164.
- Schools, masters of, not paid by the state, 243.
- Socrates, began the opposition to the sophists, 255.  
— one of the characters most difficult to be understood, 255; stands by himself not only in his own nation but in the whole history of the civilization of our race, ib.  
— his influence most closely connected with the forms of social life at Athens, 256.  
— the appearance of, was the noblest result of the separation of philosophy from religion, 257.  
— his philosophy had no immediate connection with politics, 258.
- Soldiers, mercenary, employment of, gave a death-blow to valour and patriotism, 300.
- Songs, choral, the chief ornament of the festivals, 275.
- Sophists, the first who applied philosophy to political science, 250.  
— The, the fruit of their age, 252.  
— the precepts and very name of became odious, 253.  
— cannot be deprived of the glory of having shown the necessity of a liberal education for the higher classes of their nation, 253.
- Sparta, description of, 15.  
— at the head of the whole Dorian race, 296.  
— as it was governed by the

- laws of Lycurgus alone, 296; the other Dorian states did not at all resemble it, ib.
- States in which the first offices were hereditary in certain families, 151.
- Statesman and advocate, the labours of, first became united during the Peloponnesian war, 235.
- , first appeared in the age of Solon, 220.
- employed in conducting foreign affairs, 222.
- in the early age the commanders of armies, 222.
- without pretensions to the qualifications of a general, finds no place except among a cultivated people, 223.
- of antiquity compared with those of modern times, 241.
- TAXES**, on land and houses, 177.
- on property, not paid regularly from year to year according to the same standard, 178.
- some kinds of expenses too considerable to be borne by any but the opulent, 178.
- indirect, 180.
- on articles of luxury, 182.
- who had the right of fixing them, 183.
- the regular and permanent fixed by the laws, 184.
- at Rome appointed, not by the people but by the senate, 185.
- at Athens always confirmed by the people, 185.
- Temple of Jupiter Olympius, 19.
- of Apollo at Delphi, 29.
- Temples of Olympia, Delos, and Delphi, national temples, though not in the same sense in which we call those of the Jews and the Egyptians national, 110.
- established in Greece by foreigners, 68. The building of, commonly a joint undertaking, 117. Built after the Trojan war, 286.
- Greek, had possessions of their own, 173.
- Thebes, description of, 28.
- Themistocles owed his greatness to the Persian and Salamis, 223.
- Theatres, built and decorated at the public expense, 276.
- their structure always the same, 277.
- of stone not erected until after the victories over the Persians, 278.
- Thermopylae, pass of, 30.
- Thessaly, description of, 31.
- Thucydides, the historian of his own time, 268.
- his age full of grandeur, but of difficulties, 269.
- compelled to investigate everything by personal inquiry, 270.
- the inventor of the art of historical criticism, 271.
- Tiremes, invention of, 214.
- Tragedy, the representation of great events of former times, according to the ideal conceptions of the Greeks, 279.
- in certain respects a result of Epic poetry, 280. see *Drama*.
- Tranquillity of Greece previous to the Trojan war, 73.
- Tribunals, popular, did not prevail in every state, 193.
- sources of political revolutions, 125.
- Trojan war, compared with the crusades, 84. Consequences of, 90.
- Troy, expedition against, like the crusades, a voluntary undertaking on the part of those who joined in it, 84.
- Tyrants, 156.
- Votive offerings, 289.
- War, never became a regular science till standing armies were introduced, 197.
- art of, no considerable improvement in, until the time of the Peloponnesian war, 199.
- the first campaigns of the Peloponnesian war show that it had made but little progress, 206.

- War, art of, introduction of mercenary troops, 209.  
— the higher branches of began with Epaminondas to be understood, 209.  
—, petty, between the states, 199.  
White race of mankind superior to the blacks, 4.
- Wise men, the seven, not speculative philosophers, 221.
- XENOPHON, by the mildness and modesty of his personal character secured from the faults into which men are so apt to fall who describe their own actions, 271.

THE END.

















